arXiv:1612.08680v1 [math.AP] 27 Dec 2016

SOLVABILITY AND LIMIT COMPLEX BICHARACTERISTICS

NILS DENCKER

1. Introduction

We shall consider the solvability for a classical pseudodifferential operator P on a C^∞ manifold X which is not of principal type. P is solvable at a compact set $K \subseteq X$ if the equation

$$Pu = v \tag{1.1}$$

has a local solution $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ in a neighborhood of K for any $v \in C^\infty(X)$ in a set of finite codimension.

The pseudodifferential operator P is classical if it has an asymptotic expansion $p_m + p_{m-1} + \dots$ where p_k is homogeneous of degree k in ξ and $p_m = \sigma(P)$ is the principal symbol of the operator. P is of principal type if the Hamilton vector field

$$H_p = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \partial_{\xi_j} p \partial_{x_j} - \partial_{x_j} p \partial_{\xi_j} \tag{1.2}$$

of the principal symbol $p = p_m$ does not have the radial direction $\langle \xi, \partial_\xi \rangle$ at $p^{-1}(0)$, in particular $H_p \neq 0$ then. By homogeneity H_p is well defined on the cosphere bundle $S^*X = \{ (x,\xi) \in T^*X : \ |\xi| = 1 \}$, defined by some choice of Riemannean metric, and the principal type condition means that H_p is not degenerate on S^*X. For pseudodifferential operators of principal type, it is known from [1] and [3] that local solvability is equivalent to condition (Ψ):

(1.3) $\operatorname{Im}(ap)$ does not change sign from $-$ to $+$ along the oriented bicharacteristics of $\operatorname{Re}(ap)$

for any $0 \neq a \in C^\infty(T^*M)$. This condition is of course trivial if the principal symbol is real valued. The oriented bicharacteristics are the positive flow-outs of the Hamilton vector field $H_{\operatorname{Re}(ap)} \neq 0$ on $\operatorname{Re}(ap) = 0$, and these are called semibicharacteristics of p.

We shall consider the case when P is not of principal type, instead the complex valued principal symbol vanishes of at least second order at the double characteristics Σ_2. We shall study necessary conditions for solvability when Σ_2 is an involutive manifold, and since solvability is an open condition we shall assume that P satisfies condition (Ψ) in the complement of Σ_2 where it is of principal type. Naturally, condition (Ψ) is empty on Σ_2,

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35S05 (primary) 35A01, 58J40, 47G30 (secondary).

where instead we shall have necessary conditions on the next lower term p_{m-1}, called the subprincipal symbol.

Mendoza and Uhlman [5] studied the case when principal symbol p is a product of two real symbols having transversal Hamilton vector fields at the involutive intersection Σ_2 of the characteristics. They proved that P is not solvable if the subprincipal symbol changes sign on the integral curves of these Hamilton vector fields on Σ_2, which are the limits of the bicharacteristics at Σ_2. Mendoza [6] generalized this to the case when the principal symbol is real and vanishes of second order at an involutive manifold Σ_2 having an indefinite Hessian with rank equal to the codimension of the manifold. The Hessian then gives well-defined limit bicharacteristis over Σ_2, and P is not solvable if the subprincipal symbol changes sign on any of these limit bicharacteristics. Both results have constant sign of the subprincipal symbol on the limit characteristics as a necessary condition for solvability, which corresponds to condition (P). This is natural since when the principal symbol vanishes of exactly second order one gets both directions when taking limit bicharacteristics. These results were generalized in [2] to pseudodifferential operators with real principal symbol for which the linearization of the Hamilton vector field is tangent to and has uniform bounds on the tangent spaces of some Lagrangean manifolds at the bicharacteristics. Then P is not solvable if condition (Ψ) is not satisfied on the limit bicharacteristics, in the sense that the quotient of the imaginary part of the subprincipal symbol with the norm of the Hamilton vector field switches sign from $-$ to $+$ on the semibicharacteristics and becomes unbounded when converging to the limit semibicharacteristic.

In this paper, we shall extend the results of [2] to pseudodifferential operators with complex principal symbols. We shall consider the limits of semibicharacteristics at the set where the principal symbol vanishes of at least second order. The convergence shall be as smooth curves, then the limit semibicharacteristic also is a smooth curve. We shall assume that the normalized complex Hamilton vector field of the principal symbol on the semicharacteristics converges to a real vector field on Σ_2. Then the limit semibicharacteristic are uniquely defined, and one can invariantly define the imaginary part of the subprincipal symbol. Also, we shall assume that the linearization of the real part of the normalized Hamilton vector field is tangent to and uniformly bounded on the tangent space of a Lagrangean submanifold at the semibicharacteristics, which we call a grazing Lagrangean space, see (2.7). We shall also assume uniform bounds on linearization of the imaginary part of the Hamilton vector field on the grazing Lagrangean space.

Our main result is Theorem 2.10, which essentially says that under these conditions the operator is not solvable at the limit semibicharacteristic if the quotient of the imaginary part of the subprincipal symbol with the norm of the Hamilton vector field switches sign

from $-$ to $+$ on the semibicharacteristics and becomes unbounded as they converge to the limit semibicharacteristic. This could be seen as a non-homogeneous version of condition (Ψ) on the subprincipal symbol for the limit characteristics.

2. Statement of results

Let p be the principal symbol, $\Sigma = p^{-1}(0)$ be the characteristics, and Σ_2 be the set of double characteristics, i.e., the points on Σ where $dp = 0$. Since we are going to study necessary conditions for solvability, we shall assume that P satisfies condition (Ψ) given by (1.3) on $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma \setminus \Sigma_2$. We shall study limits at Σ_2 of semibicharacteristics, and we shall assume that the normalized limit of H_p is proportional to a real vector field, in the sense that

$$|dp \wedge d\overline{p}| \ll |dp| \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_j \text{ as } j \to \infty \tag{2.1}$$

We shall only choose semibicharacteristics given by $H_{\operatorname{Re} ap}$ such that $|\operatorname{Re} a \nabla p| \geq c|\nabla p|$ at Γ_j for some $c > 0$, where ∇p is the gradient of p.

Let $\{ \Gamma_j \}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ be a set of semibicharacteristics of p on $S^*X \bigcap \Sigma_1$ so that Γ_j are bicharacteristics of $\operatorname{Re} a_j p$ where $0 \neq a_j \in C^\infty$ uniformly at Γ_j and

$$|\operatorname{Re} a_j \nabla p| \geq c|\nabla p| \qquad \text{at } \Gamma_j \tag{2.2}$$

for some fixed $c > 0$, observe that $p = 0$ on Γ_j. We shall assume that Γ_j are uniformly bounded in C^∞ when parametrized on a uniformly bounded interval (for example with respect to the arc length). The bounds are defined with respect to some choice of Riemannean metric on T^*X, but different choices of metric will only change the bounds with fixed constants. In particular, we have a uniform bound on the arc lengths:

$$|\Gamma_j| \leq C \qquad \forall\, j \tag{2.3}$$

In fact, we have that $\Gamma_j = \{ \gamma_j(t) : \ t \in I_j \}$ with $|\gamma_j'(t)| \equiv 1$ and $|I_j| \leq C$, then $|\gamma_j^{(k)}(t)| \leq C_k$ for $t \in I_j$ and $\forall\ j,\ k \geq 1$. Let $\widetilde{p} = p/|\nabla p|$ then the normalized Hamilton vector field of p is equal to

$$H_{\widetilde{p}} = |H_p|^{-1} H_p \qquad \text{on } p^{-1}(0) \setminus \Sigma_2$$

Then Γ_j is uniformly bounded in C^∞ if there exists positive constants c and C_k such that

$$|H^k_{\operatorname{Re} a_j \widetilde{p}} \nabla \operatorname{Re} a_j \widetilde{p}| \leq C_k \quad \text{and} \quad |H_{\operatorname{Re} a_j \widetilde{p}}| \geq c \quad \text{at } \Gamma_j \quad \forall\, j, k \tag{2.4}$$

which implies that $|a_j| \geq c > 0$ at Γ_j. This means that the normalized Hamilton vector field $H_{\operatorname{Re} a_j \widetilde{p}}$ is uniformly bounded in C^∞ as a non-degenerate vector field over Γ, and this only depends on $a_j\big|_{\Gamma_j}$. Observe that the semibicharacteristics have a natural orientation given by the Hamilton vector field. Now the set of semibicharacteristic curves $\{ \Gamma_j \}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ is uniformly bounded in C^∞ when parametrized with respect to the arc length, and therefore it is a precompact set. Thus there exists a subsequence Γ_{j_k}, $k \to \infty$, that converge to

a smooth curve Γ (possibly a point), called a limit semibicharacteristic by the following definition.

Definition 2.1. *We say that a sequence of smooth curves Γ_j on a smooth manifold converges to a smooth limit curve Γ (possibly a point) if there exist parametrizations on uniformly bounded intervals that converge in C^∞. If $p \in C^\infty(T^*X)$, then we say that $\{\Gamma_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ are a uniform family of semibicharacteristics of p if* (2.3) *and* (2.4) *hold. A smooth curve $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_2 \bigcap S^*X$ is a* limit semibicharacteristic *of p if there exists a uniform family of semibicharacteristics of p that converge to it.*

Naturally, this definition is invariant under symplectic changes of coordinates, and the set $\{\Gamma_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ may have subsequences converging to several different limit semibicharacteristics, which could be points. For example, if Γ_j is parametrized with respect to the arc length on intervals I_j such that $|I_j| \to 0$, then we find that Γ_j converges to a limit curve which is a point. Observe that if Γ_j converge to a limit semibicharacteristic Γ, then (2.3) and (2.4) hold for Γ_j.

Example 2.2. *Let Γ_j be the curve parametrized by*

$$[0,1] \ni t \mapsto \gamma_j(t) = (t, \cos(jt)/j, \sin(jt)/j)/\sqrt{2}$$

Since $|\gamma_j'(t)| = 1$, the curves are parametrized with respect to arc length, and we have that $\Gamma_j \to \Gamma = \{\, (t,0,0) : \ t \in [0, 2^{-1/2}] \,\}$ in C^0, but not in C^∞ since $|\gamma_j''(t)| = j/\sqrt{2}$. If we parametrize Γ_j with $x = jt \in [0,j]$ we find that Γ_j converge to Γ in C^∞ but not on uniformly bounded intervals.

But we shall also need a condition on the differential of the Hamilton vector field H_p at the semibicharacteristic Γ along a Lagrangean space, which will give bounds on the curvature of the semicharacteristics in these directions. If the semicharacteristics is the bicharacteristic of $\operatorname{Re} ap$ then we shall denote $\Sigma = (\operatorname{Re} ap)^{-1}(0)$ and $T_w\Sigma = \operatorname{Ker} d\operatorname{Re} ap(w) \subset T(T^*X)$, where $d\operatorname{Re} ap(w) \neq 0$ for $w \in \Gamma$. A section of Lagrangean spaces L over a bicharacteristic Γ is a map

$$\Gamma \ni w \mapsto L(w) \subset T_w(T^*X)$$

such that $L(w)$ is a Lagrangean space in $T_w\Sigma$, $\forall\, w \in \Gamma$. If the section L is C^1 then it has tangent space $TL \subset T_L(T_\Gamma(T^*X))$. Observe that since $L(w) \subset T_w\Sigma$ is Lagrangean we find $d\operatorname{Re} ap(w)\big|_{L(w)} = 0$ and $H_{\operatorname{Re} ap}(w) \in L(w)$ when $w \in \Gamma$. Now we shall also have the condition that the *linearization* of $H_{\operatorname{Re} ap}$ at Γ is tangent to the Lagrangean space L.

Definition 2.3. *Let Γ be a semibicharacteristic of p, i.e., a bicharacteristic of* $\operatorname{Re}(ap)$ *for some $0 \neq a \in C^\infty$. We say that a C^1 section of Lagrangean spaces L over Γ is a section of* grazing Lagrangean spaces *of Γ if $L \subset T_\Gamma\Sigma = \operatorname{Ker} d\operatorname{Re} ap\big|_\Gamma \subset T_\Gamma(T^*X)$, and the linearization (or first order jet) of $H_{\operatorname{Re} ap} \subset T_\Gamma L$, the tangent space of L at Γ.*

The linearization of $H_{\operatorname{Re} ap}(w)$ is given by the second order Taylor expansion of $\operatorname{Re} ap$ at w and since $L(w)$ is Lagrangean we find that terms in that expansion that vanish on $L(w)$ have Hamilton field parallel to L. Thus, the condition that the linearization of $H_{\operatorname{Re} ap}(w)$ is in $TL(w)$ only depends on the restriction to $L(w)$ of the second order Taylor expansion of $\operatorname{Re} ap$ at w. We find that Definition 2.3 is invariant under multiplication of $\operatorname{Re} ap$ by non-vanishing real factors because $\operatorname{Re} ap(w) = 0$ and $d \operatorname{Re} ap(w)\big|_{L(w)} = 0$ since $L \subset T_\Gamma \Sigma$. Thus the linearization of $H_{\operatorname{Re} cap}$ is determined by $\operatorname{Hess} \operatorname{Re} cap(w)\big|_{L(w)} = c \operatorname{Hess} \operatorname{Re} ap(w)\big|_{L(w)}$ when c is real. Thus the linearization only depends on the argument $\arg a_j$ at Γ_j and we can replace $H_{\operatorname{Re} ap}(w)$ by $H_{\operatorname{Re} a\widetilde{p}}$ in the definition.

By Definition 2.3 we find that the linearization of $H_{\operatorname{Re} ap}$ gives an evolution equation for the section L, see Example 2.4. Choosing a Lagrangean subspace of $T_{w_0}\Sigma$ at $w_0 \in \Gamma$ then determines L along Γ, so L must be smooth. Actually, L is the tangent space at Γ of a smooth Lagrangean submanifold of $(\operatorname{Re} ap)^{-1}(0)$, see (3.28).

Example 2.4. *Let $p = \tau + ia(t,x)\xi_1 - (\langle A(t,x)x, x\rangle + 2\langle B(t,x)x, \xi\rangle + \langle C(t,x)\xi, \xi\rangle)/2$, $(x,\xi) \in T^*\mathbf{R}^n$, where $A(t,x)$, $B(t,x)$ and $C(t,x) \in C^\infty$ are $n \times n$ matrices, such that $A(t,x) = A^t(t,x)$ and $C(t) = C^t(t,x)$ are symmetric, and let $\Gamma = \{\, (t,0,0,\xi_0) : \ t \in I \,\}$. Then $H_{\operatorname{Re} p} = \partial_t$ at Γ and*

$$(\operatorname{Re} p)^{-1}(0) = \{\, \tau = \langle \operatorname{Re} A(t,x)x, x\rangle/2 + \langle \operatorname{Re} B(t,x)x, \xi\rangle + \langle \operatorname{Re} C(t,x)\xi, \xi\rangle/2 \,\}$$

where $\operatorname{Re} F$ is the given by the real part of the elements of F. The linearization of the Hamilton field H_p at $(t,0,0,\xi_0)$ is

$$\partial_t + ia(t,0)\partial_{x_1} + \langle A(t,0)y + B^t(t,0)\eta, \partial_\eta\rangle - \langle B(t,0)y + C(t,0)\eta, \partial_y\rangle \tag{2.5}$$

with $(y,\eta) \in T(T^*\mathbf{R}^n)$. Since $d \operatorname{Re} p = d\tau$ at Γ, a C^1 section of Lagrangean spaces $L(t) \subset T_\Gamma\Sigma$ must be tangent to Γ. Thus, by choosing linear symplectic coordinates (y,η) we may obtain that

$$L(t) = \{\, (s,y,0,E(t)y) : (s,y) \in \mathbf{R}^n \,\}$$

where $E(t) \in C^1$ is real and symmetric with $E(0) = 0$. By applying (2.5) on $\eta - E(t)y$, which vanishes on $L(t)$, we obtain that $L(t)$ is a grazing Lagrangean space if

$$\partial_t E(t) = \operatorname{Re} A(t,0) + \operatorname{Re} B(t,0)E(t) + E(t) \operatorname{Re} B^t(t) + E(t) \operatorname{Re} C(t,0)E(t) \tag{2.6}$$

Then by uniqueness we find that $L(t)$ is constant in t if and only if $\operatorname{Re} A(t,0) \equiv 0$, and then $A(t,0) = \operatorname{Hess} p\big|_{L(t)}$. In general, the real part of $\operatorname{Hess} p\big|_{L(t)}$ is given by the right hand side of (2.6).

Example 2.5. *If p is of principal type, then one can choose $a \neq 0$ and symplectic coordinates so that $\operatorname{Re} ap = \tau$ near $\Gamma = \{\, (t,0,0,\xi_0) : \ t \in I \,\}$. Then one can take any Lagrangean plane in $\operatorname{Ker} d\tau\big|_\Gamma = T_\Gamma\Sigma$ which is tangent to Γ.*

Observe that we may choose symplectic coordinates $(t, x; \tau, \xi)$ so that $\tau = \operatorname{Re} ap$ and the fiber of $L(w)$ is equal to $\{\,(s, y, 0, 0) : (s, y) \in \mathbf{R}^n\,\}$ at $w \in \Gamma = \{\,(t, 0; 0, \xi_0) :\ t \in I\,\}$. But it is not clear that we can do that *uniformly* for a family of semibicharacteristics $\{\,\Gamma_j\,\}$, for that we need additional conditions. We shall assume that there exists a grazing Lagrangean space L_j of Γ_j, $\forall\, j$, such that the normalized Hamilton vector field $H_{\widetilde{p}}$ satisfies

$$\left| dH_{\widetilde{p}}(w)\big|_{L_j(w)} \right| \le C \qquad \text{for } w \in \Gamma_j \quad \forall\, j \tag{2.7}$$

This is equivalent to

$$\left| dH_p(w)\big|_{L_j(w)} \right| \le C|H_p| \tag{2.8}$$

for $w \in \Gamma_j$ since $L \subset T_\Gamma\Sigma$. In fact, we have that $dH_{bp} = dbH_p + bdH_p + dpH_b$ on Σ. Since the mapping $\Gamma_j \ni w \mapsto L_j(w)$ is determined by the linearization of $H_{\operatorname{Re} a_j\widetilde{p}}$ on L_j, thus by $dH_{\operatorname{Re} a_j\widetilde{p}}(w)\big|_{L_j(w)}$, condition (2.7) implies that $\Gamma_j \ni w \mapsto L_j(w)$ is uniformly in C^1, see Example 2.4. Observe that condition (2.4) gives (2.7) in the direction of $T_w\Gamma_j \subset L_j(w)$. Clearly condition (2.7) is invariant under changes of symplectic coordinates and multiplications with non-vanishing real factors.

Observe that condition (2.7) gives

$$\left| d\nabla \operatorname{Re} a_j\widetilde{p}(w)\big|_{L_j(w)} \right| \le C \qquad \text{for } w \in \Gamma_j \quad \forall\, j \tag{2.9}$$

Since $\nabla \operatorname{Re} a_j\widetilde{p}$ is uniformly proportional to the normal of the level surface $(\operatorname{Re} a_j p)^{-1}(0)$, condition (2.9) gives a uniform bound on the curvature of the level surface $(\operatorname{Re} a_j p)^{-1}(0)$ in the directions given by L_j over Γ_j.

Example 2.6. *Assume that $p(x, \xi)$ vanishes of exactly order $k \ge 2$ at the involutive submanifold $\Sigma_2 = \{\,\xi' = 0\,\}$, $\xi = (\xi', \xi'') \in \mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^{n-m}$, such that the localization*

$$\eta \mapsto \sum_{|\alpha|=k} \partial_{\xi'}^\alpha p(x, 0, \xi'')\eta^\alpha$$

is of principal type when $\eta \neq 0$. Then the semibicharacteristics of p with $|\operatorname{Re} a_j\nabla\widetilde{p}| \cong 1$ satisfies (2.4) *and* (2.7) *with $L_j = \{\,\xi = 0\,\}$ at any point. In fact, $|\partial_{\xi'}p(x, \xi)| \cong |\xi'|^{k-1}$ and $\partial_{x,\xi''}p(x, \xi) = \mathcal{O}(|\xi'|^k)$ so $H_{\widetilde{p}} = \partial_{\xi'}\widetilde{p}\partial_{x'} + \mathcal{O}(|\xi'|)$ and $\partial_x^\alpha\nabla p = \mathcal{O}(|\xi'|^{k-1})$, $\forall\,\alpha$, when $|\xi'| \ll 1$ and $|\xi| \cong 1$.*

Now for the principal symbol we shall denote

$$0 < \min_{\Gamma_j} |H_p| = \kappa_j \to 0 \qquad j \to \infty \tag{2.10}$$

and we shall assume that

$$|dp \wedge d\overline{p}\,| \le C\kappa_j^{14/3}|H_p|^2 \qquad \text{at } \Gamma_j \tag{2.11}$$

which by Leibniz' rule means that $|d \operatorname{Re}\widetilde{p} \wedge d \operatorname{Im}\widetilde{p}| \le C\kappa_j^{14/3}$ on Γ_j. In fact, we have

$$d(ap) \wedge d(\overline{ap}) = |a|^2 dp \wedge d\overline{p} + 2i \operatorname{Im}(a\overline{p}\, dp \wedge d\overline{a}) + |p|^2 da \wedge d\overline{a} \tag{2.12}$$

where the two last terms vanish on Σ. This gives a measure on the complex part of H_p and gives that $H_{\widetilde{p}}$ is proportional to a real vector field on Γ_j modulo terms that are $\mathcal{O}(\kappa_j^4)$.

We shall also assume the following condition

$$\left| d\big|_{L_j}(dp \wedge d\overline{p})(w) \right| \leq C\kappa_j^{4/3}|H_p|^2 \qquad \text{for } w \in \Gamma_j \ \ \forall\, j \tag{2.13}$$

where the outer differential is restricted to L_j on Γ_j. Observe that condition (2.13) gives an estimate on the variation of the complex part of the Hamilton vector field along L, whereas condition (2.7) gives an estimate on the variation of the Hamilton vector field. Using (2.8), (2.11) and (2.12) we find that (2.13) is equivalent to

$$\left| d\big|_{L_j}(d\operatorname{Re}\widetilde{p} \wedge d\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{p})(w) \right| \leq C\kappa_j^{4/3} \qquad \text{for } w \in \Gamma_j \ \ \forall\, j$$

In fact, the differential of the two last terms in (2.12) vanish since $dp = 0$ on L_j and if $a = |\nabla p|^{-1}$ then $da\big|_{L_j} = \mathcal{O}(a)$ by (2.8).

If $|\nabla \operatorname{Re}\widetilde{p}\,| \cong |\nabla\widetilde{p}\,| = 1$, then we find from (2.11) that

$$|d\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{p}(w)| \leq C\kappa_j^{14/3} \qquad \text{on } \operatorname{Ker} d\operatorname{Re}\widetilde{p}(w) \tag{2.14}$$

for $w \in \Gamma_j$. Since $d\big|_{L_j} d\operatorname{Im}\operatorname{Re} p(w) = \mathcal{O}(1)$ by (2.7), we find from (2.13) that

$$d\big|_{L_j} d\operatorname{Im}\widetilde{p}(w) = \mathcal{O}(\kappa_j^{4/3}) \qquad \text{on } \operatorname{Ker} d\operatorname{Re}\widetilde{p}(w) \tag{2.15}$$

when $w \in \Gamma_j$. The estimates (2.14) and (2.15) will be needed in order to handle the imaginary part of the principal symbol as a perturbation, see Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2.

Now, since the semibicharacteristics Γ_j are uniform we have $|H_{\operatorname{Re} a_j\widetilde{p}}| \geq c$, which by (2.11) gives

$$\operatorname{Im}(a_j\nabla\widetilde{p}) = \beta_j \operatorname{Re}(a_j\nabla\widetilde{p}) + V_j \tag{2.16}$$

where $\beta_j = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $|V_j| \leq C\kappa_j^{14/3}$ near w_0. The first part of the right hand side will not change the direction of Γ_j. Thus multiplying with the complex factor $1 - i\beta_j$ only changes the direction of the real part of the Hamilton vector field by terms that are $\mathcal{O}(\kappa_j^{14/3})$. This only perturbs Γ_j so that the distance to the original semibicharacteristic is $\mathcal{O}(\kappa_j^{14/3})$. Since the linearization of the real part of the Hamilton vector field is changed with a bounded factor and terms that are $\mathcal{O}(\kappa_j^{14/3})$, we find from (2.6) that the grazing Lagrangean spaces is only changed by terms that are $\mathcal{O}(\kappa_j^{14/3})$. Since $\kappa_j \leq |H_p|$ on Γ_j we find that conditions (2.8), (2.11) and (2.13) are not changed. Observe that a_j is only defined on Γ_j, but since Γ_j is a uniformly bounded smooth curve, a_j can easily be uniformly extended to a neighborhood of Γ_j.

Remark 2.7. *The family of uniform semibicharacteristics* $\{\,\Gamma_j\,\}_j$ *satisfying condition* (2.11) *and the grazing Lagrangean spaces* L_j *of* Γ_j *are invariant modulo perturbations of* $\mathcal{O}(\kappa_j^{14/3})$ *under different choices of* a_j *in* (2.4). *Thus conditions* (2.8), (2.11) *and* (2.13) *are well defined independently of the choice of* a_j.

Thus, the choice of a_j will be irrelevant when taking the limit. Now, we shall only consider semibicharacteristics Γ_j with tangent vectors $H_{\operatorname{Re} a_j\widetilde{p}}$ so that

$$|H_{\operatorname{Im} a_j\widetilde{p}}| \le C\kappa_j^{14/3} \quad \text{and } |a_j| > 1/C \text{ on } \Gamma_j \tag{2.17}$$

which implies that $|\operatorname{Re}\nabla a_j\widetilde{p}| \ge c > 0$ when $\kappa_j \ll 1$. Then the multipliers a_j are well defined on Γ_j modulo uniformly bounded factors which have argument that are $\mathcal{O}(\kappa_j^{14/3})$.

The invariant subprincipal symbol p_s will be important for the solvability of the operator near Σ_2. For the usual Kohn-Nirenberg quantization of pseudodifferential operators, the next lower order term is equal to

$$p_s = p_{m-1} - \frac{1}{2i}\sum_j \partial_{\xi_j}\partial_{x_j}p \tag{2.18}$$

and for the Weyl quantization it is p_{m-1}. Both of these are equal to p_{m-1} at the involutive maniford Σ_2.

For the subprincipal symbol p_s we shall have a condition that essentially means that condition (Ψ) does not hold for the subprincipal symbol. Observe that (2.17) gives that the imaginary part of a_jp_s is well defined modulo terms that are $\mathcal{O}(\kappa_j^{14/3})$. Assuming (2.17) we shall have the condition that

$$\min_{\partial\Gamma_j}\int \operatorname{Im} a_jp_s|H_p|^{-1}\,ds/|\log\kappa_j| \to \infty \qquad j\to\infty \tag{2.19}$$

where the integration is along the natural orientation given by $H_{\operatorname{Re} a_jp}$ on Γ_j starting at some point $w_j \in \overset{\circ}{\Gamma}_j$. (Actually, it suffices that the minimum in (2.19) is sufficiently large, depending on the norms of the symbol of the operator.) Since $|H_p| \ge \kappa_j \to 0$ on Γ_j, we find that condition (2.19) is well defined independently of the choice of multiplier a_j satisfying (2.17).

Observe that if (2.19) holds then there must be a change of sign of $\operatorname{Im} a_jp_s$ from $-$ to $+$ on Γ_j, and

$$\max_{\Gamma_j}(-1)^{\pm1}\operatorname{Im} a_jp_s/|H_p||\log\kappa_j| \to \infty \qquad j\to\infty \tag{2.20}$$

for both signs. Observe that condition (2.19) for a_j satisfying (2.17) is invariant under symplectic changes of coordinates and multiplication with elliptic pseudodifferential operators, thus under conjugation with elliptic Fourier integral operators. In fact, multiplication only changes the subprincipal symbol with uniform non-vanishing factors and terms proportional to $|\nabla p\,| = |H_p|$. By multiplying with a_j we may for simplicity assume that $a_j \equiv 1$. Then by choosing symplectic coordinates $(t,x;\tau,\xi)$ near a given point $w_0 \in \Gamma_j$ so that $\operatorname{Re} p = \alpha\tau$ near w_0 with $\alpha = |\operatorname{Re}\nabla p| \ne 0$, we obtain that $\partial_{x_k}\partial_{\xi_k}\operatorname{Re} p = 0$ at Γ_j, $\forall\ k$, and $\partial_t\partial_\tau\operatorname{Re} p = \partial_t\alpha = \partial_t|\operatorname{Re}\nabla p\,|$ at Γ_j near w_0. Thus, the second term in (2.18) only gives terms which are either real or gives terms in condition (2.19) which

are bounded by

$$\left|\int \partial_t |\operatorname{Re}\nabla p|/|\nabla \operatorname{Re} p|\, ds/|\log(\kappa_j)|\right| = \mathcal{O}(|\log(|\nabla \operatorname{Re} p|)|/|\log(\kappa_j)|) = \mathcal{O}(1) \tag{2.21}$$

when $j \gg 1$ since $|\operatorname{Re}\nabla p| \cong |\nabla p| \geq \kappa_j \to 0$ on Γ_j by (2.17). Thus we obtain the following result.

Remark 2.8. *We may replace the subprincipal symbol p_s by p_{m-1} in* (2.19)*, since the difference is bounded as $j \to \infty$.*

One can define the *reduced principal symbol* as $p + p_s$, see Definition 18.1.33 in [4]. Then (2.19) means that a non-homogeneous version of condition (Ψ) does not hold for the reduced principal symbol.

We shall study the microlocal solvability, which is given by the following definition. Recall that $H^{loc}_{(s)}(X)$ is the set of distributions that are locally in the L^2 Sobolev space $H_{(s)}(X)$.

Definition 2.9. *If $K \subset S^*X$ is a compact set, then we say that P is microlocally solvable at K if there exists an integer N so that for every $f \in H^{loc}_{(N)}(X)$ there exists $u \in \mathcal{D}'(X)$ such that $K \bigcap \mathrm{WF}(Pu - f) = \emptyset$.*

Observe that solvability at a compact set $M \subset X$ is equivalent to solvability at $S^*X\big|_M$ by [4, Theorem 26.4.2], and that solvability at a set implies solvability at a subset. Also, by Proposition 26.4.4 in [4] the microlocal solvability is invariant under conjugation by elliptic Fourier integral operators and multiplication by elliptic pseudodifferential operators. The following is the main result of the paper.

Theorem 2.10. *Let $P \in \Psi^m_{cl}(X)$ have principal symbol $\sigma(P) = p$ satisfying condition (Ψ), and subprincipal symbol p_s. Let $\Gamma_j \subset \Sigma \bigcap S^*X$, $j = 1, \dots$ be a uniform family of semibicharacteristics of p so that* (2.8)*,* (2.11)*,* (2.13) *and* (2.19) *hold for some a_j satisfying* (2.17) *and grazing Lagrangean spaces L_j of Γ. Then P is not microlocally solvable at any limit semibicharacteristics of $\{\Gamma_j\}_j$.*

In fact, if there exists a limit semibicharacteristic, then we can choose a subsequence of semibicharacteristics Γ_j converging to it, which gives conditions (2.3) and (2.4) for these Γ_j, $\forall\, j$. Observe that if the principal symbol is real, then conditions (Ψ), (2.11) and (2.13) are trivially satified, thus we obtain Theorem 2.8 in [2].

To prove Theorem 2.10 we shall use the following result. Let $\|u\|_{(k)}$ be the L^2 Sobolev norm of order k for $u \in C^\infty_0$ and P^* the L^2 adjoint of P.

Remark 2.11. *If P is microlocally solvable at $\Gamma \subset S^*X$, then Lemma 26.4.5 in* [4] *gives that for any $Y \Subset X$ such that $\Gamma \subset S^*Y$ there exists an integer ν and a pseudodifferential*

operator A so that $\mathrm{WF}(A) \cap \Gamma = \emptyset$ *and*

$$\|u\|_{(-N)} \leq C(\|P^*u\|_{(\nu)} + \|u\|_{(-N-n)} + \|Au\|_{(0)}) \qquad u \in C_0^\infty(Y) \tag{2.22}$$

where N is given by Definition 2.9. Since that definition also holds for larger N, we may take $\nu = N \geq 0$.

We shall use Remark 2.11 to prove Theorem 2.10 in Section 6 by constructing approximate local solutions to $P^*u = 0$. We shall first prepare and get a microlocal normal form for the adjoint operator, which will be done in Section 3. We shall then apply P^* to an oscillatory solution, for which we shall solve the eikonal equation in Section 4 and the transport equations in Section 5.

3. The normal form

In the following we assume that the conditions in Theorem 2.10 holds with some limit semibicharacteristic, observe that (2.3) and (2.4) hold for Γ_j. We shall prepare the operator to a normal form as in [2], but since the principal symbol now is complex valued the preparation will be slightly different. First we shall put the adjoint operator P^* on a normal form uniformly and microlocally near the semibicharacteristics $\Gamma_j \subset \Sigma \bigcap S^*X$ converging in C^∞ to $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_2$. This will present some difficulties since we only have conditions at the semibicharacteristics. By the invariance, we may multiply with an elliptic operator so that the order of P^* is $m = 1$ and P^* has the symbol expansion $p + p_0 + \dots$, where p is the principal symbol. By Remark 2.8 we may assume that p_0 is the subprincipal symbol, and as before we shall assume (2.17) so that $|\operatorname{Re} \nabla p| \cong |\nabla p|$. Observe that $p = 0$ on Γ_j and for the adjoint the signs in (2.19) are reversed, changing it to

$$\max_{\partial\Gamma_j} \int \operatorname{Im} a_j p_0 |H_p|^{-1}\, ds/|\log \kappa_j| \to -\infty \qquad j \to \infty \tag{3.1}$$

where κ_j given by (2.10), which is well defined under the conditions. Changing w_j to the maximum of the integral in (3.1) only improves the estimate so we may assume that

$$\int \operatorname{Im} a_j p_0/|H_p|\, ds \leq 0 \qquad \text{on } \Gamma_j \tag{3.2}$$

with equality at $w_j \in \Gamma_j$. Since ∇p_0 and ∇H_p are bounded on S^*X and $|H_p| \geq \kappa_j$ on Γ_j, we find that $|H_p|$ and $p_0/|H_p|$ only change with a fixed factor and a bounded term on some interval of length $\lesssim \kappa_j$ on Γ_j. Therefore, we find that integrating $\operatorname{Im} a_j p_0/|H_p|$ over such intervals only gives bounded terms. Thus, by (2.20) we may assume that

$$|\Gamma_j| \gg \kappa_j \tag{3.3}$$

and that condition (3.1) holds on some intervals of length $\cong \kappa_j$ at the endpoints of Γ_j.

Now we choose

$$1 \leq \lambda_j = \kappa_j^{-1/\varepsilon} \Leftrightarrow \kappa_j = \lambda_j^{-\varepsilon} \tag{3.4}$$

for some $\varepsilon > 0$ to be determined later. Then we may replace $|\log \kappa_j|$ with $\log \lambda_j$ in (3.1). By choosing a subsequence and renumbering, we may assume by (2.19) that

$$\min_{\partial\Gamma_j} \int \operatorname{Im} a_j p_0/|H_p|\, ds \leq -j \log \lambda_j \tag{3.5}$$

and that this holds on some intervals of length $\cong \kappa_j$ at the endpoints of Γ_j. Next, we introduce the normalized principal and subprincipal symbols

$$\widetilde{p} = p/|H_p| \qquad \text{and} \qquad p_s = p_0/|H_p| \tag{3.6}$$

then we have that $H_{\widetilde{p}}\big|_{\Gamma_j} \in C^\infty$ uniformly, $|H_{\widetilde{p}}| = 1$ on Γ_j and $dH_{\widetilde{p}}\big|_{L_j}$ is uniformly bounded at Γ_j by (2.4) and (2.7). We find that condition (3.5) becomes

$$\min_{\partial\Gamma_j} \int \operatorname{Im} a_j p_s\, ds \leq -j \log \lambda_j \tag{3.7}$$

Observe that because of condition (2.20) we have that $\partial\Gamma_j$ has two components since $\operatorname{Im} p_s$ has opposite sign there, thus Γ_j is a uniformly embedded curve.

In the following we shall consider a fixed semibicharacteristic $\Gamma_j \subset \Sigma \bigcap S^*X$ and suppress the index j, so that $a = a_j$, $\Gamma = \Gamma_j$, $L = L_j$ and $\kappa = \kappa_j = \lambda^{-\varepsilon}$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$ to be determined later. Observe that the preparation will be uniform in j under the conditions in Theorem 2.10. Now $H_{\operatorname{Re} a\widetilde{p}} \in C^\infty$ uniformly on Γ but not in a neighborhood. By (2.4) we may define the first order Taylor expansion of $\operatorname{Re} a\widetilde{p}$ at Γ uniformly. Since $\Gamma \in C^\infty$ uniformly, we can choose local coordinates uniformly so that $\Gamma = \{\,(t,0)) :\ t \in I \subset \mathbf{R}\,\}$ locally. In fact, take a local parametrization $\gamma(t)$ of Γ with respect to the arc length and choose the orthogonal space $M \subset \mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ to the tangent vector of Γ at a point w_0 with respect to some local Riemannean metric. Then $\mathbf{R} \times M \ni (t,w) \mapsto \gamma(t) + w$ is uniformly bounded in C^∞ with uniformly bounded inverse near $(t_0, 0)$ giving local coordinates near Γ. We may then complete t to a symplectic coordinate system uniformly. Multiplying with the uniformly bounded function $a(t,0)$ we may assume that $a(t,0) \equiv 1$. We can define the first order Taylor term of $\operatorname{Re}\widetilde{p}$ at Γ by

$$\varrho(t,w) = \partial_w \operatorname{Re}\widetilde{p}(t,0) \cdot w \qquad w = (x,\tau,\xi) \tag{3.8}$$

which is uniformly bounded. This can be done locally, and by using a uniformly bounded partition of unity we obtain this in a fixed neighborhood of Γ. Going back to the original coordinates, we find that $\varrho \in C^\infty$ uniformly near Γ and $\operatorname{Re}\widetilde{p} - \varrho = \mathcal{O}(d^2)$, but the error is not uniformly bounded. Here d is the homogeneous distance to Γ, i.e., the distance with respect to the homogeneous metric

$$dt^2 + |dx|^2 + (d\tau^2 + |d\xi|^2)/\langle(\tau,\xi)\rangle^2$$

But by condition (2.7) we find that the second order derivatives of $\widetilde{p}$ along the Lagrangean space L at Γ are uniformly bounded. We shall use homogeneous coordinates, i.e., local coordinates which are normalized with respect to the homogeneous metric.

By completing $\tau = \varrho$ in (3.8) to a uniformly bounded homogeneous symplectic coordinate system $(\tau, w) = (\tau, x, \tau, \xi)$ near Γ and conjugating with the corresponding uniformly bounded Fourier integral operator we may assume that

$$\Gamma = \{\, (t, 0; 0, \xi_0) : \ t \in I \,\} \subset S^*\mathbf{R}^n \tag{3.9}$$

for $|\xi_0| = 1$, some fixed interval $I \ni 0$, and $\operatorname{Re}\widetilde{p} \cong \tau$ modulo second order terms at Γ. The second order terms are not uniformly bounded, but $d\nabla\widetilde{p}\big|_L$ is uniformly bounded at Γ by (2.7). Since $d\operatorname{Re}\widetilde{p} = d\tau$ on Γ we find that $H_{\operatorname{Re}\widetilde{p}}\big|_\Gamma = D_t$ and we may obtain that $L = \{\, (t, x; 0, 0) \,\}$ at any given point at Γ by choosing linear symplectic coordinates (x, ξ). We find from (2.7) that

$$\big|d\nabla\widetilde{p}(t, 0; 0, \xi_0)\big|_L\big| \lesssim 1 \qquad t \in I \tag{3.10}$$

Condition (2.14) gives

$$|\partial_{t,x,\xi} \operatorname{Im}\widetilde{p}(t, 0; 0, \xi_0)| \lesssim \kappa^{14/3} = \lambda^{-14\varepsilon/3} \qquad t \in I \tag{3.11}$$

and condition (2.15) gives

$$\big|d\,\partial_{t,x,\xi} \operatorname{Im}\widetilde{p}(t, 0; 0, \xi_0)\big|_L\big| \lesssim \lambda^{-4\varepsilon/3} \qquad t \in I \tag{3.12}$$

Here $a \lesssim b$ (and $b \gtrsim a$) means that $a \le Cb$ for some $C > 0$.

Let

$$q(t, w) = |\nabla p(t, w)| \ge \lambda^{-\varepsilon} \qquad \text{at } \Gamma \tag{3.13}$$

and extended so that q is homogeneous of degree 0, thus q is the norm of the homogeneous gradient of p. Recall that λ is a parameter that depends on the bicharacteristic Γ. Since the symbols are homogeneous, we shall restrict them to $S^*\mathbf{R}^n$. There we shall choose coordinates (t, w) so that $w = 0$ on Γ, and then localize in neighborhoods depending on λ. We have $|\nabla\widetilde{p}| \equiv 1$ at Γ, higher derivatives are not uniformly bounded but can be handled by the using the metric

$$g_\varepsilon = (dt^2 + |dw|^2)\lambda^{2\varepsilon}$$

and the symbol classes $f \in S(m, g_\varepsilon)$ defined by $\partial^\alpha f = \mathcal{O}(m\lambda^{|\alpha|\varepsilon})$, $\forall\, \alpha$.

Proposition 3.1. *If* (3.13) *holds then q is a weight for g_ε, $q \in S(q, g_\varepsilon)$ and $\widetilde{p}(t, w) \in S(\lambda^{-\varepsilon}, g_\varepsilon)$ when $|w| \le c\lambda^{-\varepsilon}$ for some $c > 0$ on $S^*\mathbf{R}^n$ when $t \in I$.*

This gives $p = q\widetilde{p} \in S(q\lambda^{-\varepsilon}, g_\varepsilon)$ when $|w| \le c\lambda^{-\varepsilon}$. Observe that $b \in S^\mu_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ if and only if $b \in S(\lambda^\mu, g_\varepsilon)$ in homogeneous coordinates when $|\xi| \cong \lambda \gtrsim 1$. In fact, in homogeneous coordinates z this means that $\partial_z^\alpha b = \mathcal{O}(|\xi|^{\mu+|\alpha|\varepsilon})$ when $|z| \cong 1$. Therefore, we obtain by homogeneity that $\widetilde{p} \in S^{1-\varepsilon}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ and $q^{-1} \in S^\varepsilon_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ when $|\xi| \cong \lambda \gtrsim 1$.

Proof. We are going to use the previously chosen coordinates (t, w) on $S^*\mathbf{R}^n$ so that $\Gamma = \{\, (t, 0) : \ t \in I \,\}$. Now $\partial^2 p = \mathcal{O}(1)$, $q \geq \lambda^{-\varepsilon}$ at Γ by (3.13) and

$$\partial q = 2 \operatorname{Re} \nabla \overline{p} \cdot (\partial \nabla p)/q \qquad \text{when } q \neq 0 \tag{3.14}$$

which is uniformly bounded. We find that $q(s, w) \cong q(t, 0)$ when $|s - t| + |w| \leq c\lambda^{-\varepsilon}$ for small enough $c > 0$, so q is a weight for g_ε there. This gives that $|p(t, w)| \lesssim q(t, w)\lambda^{-\varepsilon}$, $|\nabla p(t, w)| = q(t, w)$ and $|\partial^\alpha p| \lesssim 1 \lesssim q\lambda^\varepsilon$ for $|\alpha| \geq 2$, which gives $p \in S(q\lambda^{-\varepsilon}, g_\varepsilon)$ when $|w| \leq c\lambda^{-\varepsilon}$.

We find from (3.14) that $\partial q = \mathcal{O}(q\lambda^\varepsilon)$ when $|w| \leq c\lambda^{-\varepsilon}$, since $\nabla p \in S(q, g_\varepsilon)$ in this domain. By induction over the order of differentiation of q we obtain from (3.14) that $q \in S(q, g_\varepsilon)$ when $|w| \leq c\lambda^{-\varepsilon}$, which gives the result. □

As before, we take the restriction of $\widetilde{p}$ to $|\xi| = 1$, using the local coordinates (t, w) and put $Q(t, w) = \lambda^\varepsilon \widetilde{p}(t\lambda^{-\varepsilon}, w\lambda^{-\varepsilon})$ when $t \in I_\varepsilon = \{\, t\lambda^\varepsilon : \ t \in I \,\}$. Then by Proposition 3.1 we find that $Q \in C^\infty$ uniformly when $|w| \lesssim 1$ and $t \in I_\varepsilon$, $\partial_\tau \operatorname{Re} Q \equiv 1$ and $|\partial_{t,x,\xi} \operatorname{Re} Q| \equiv 0$ when $w = 0$ and $t \in I_\varepsilon$. Thus we find $|\partial_\tau Q| \neq 0$ for $|w| \lesssim 1$ and $t \in I_\varepsilon$. By using Taylor's formula at Γ we can write $Q(t, x; \tau, \xi) = \tau + h(t, x; \tau, \xi)$ when $|w| \lesssim 1$ and $t \in I_\varepsilon$, where $h = |\nabla \operatorname{Re} h| = 0$ at $w = 0$. By using the Malgrange preparation theorem, we obtain

$$\tau = a(t, w)(\tau + h(t, w)) + s(t, x, \xi) \qquad |w| \lesssim 1 \quad t \in I_\varepsilon$$

where a and $s \in C^\infty$ uniformly, $a \neq 0$, and on Γ we have $a = 1$ and $s = |\nabla \operatorname{Re} s| = 0$. In fact, this can be done locally in t and by a uniform partition of unity for $t \in I_\varepsilon$. This gives

$$a(t, w)Q(t, w) = \tau - s(t, x, \xi) \qquad |w| \lesssim 1 \quad t \in I_\varepsilon \tag{3.15}$$

In the original coordinates, we find that

$$\lambda^\varepsilon \widetilde{p}(t, w) = a^{-1}(t\lambda^\varepsilon, w\lambda^\varepsilon)(\tau\lambda^\varepsilon - s(t\lambda^\varepsilon, x\lambda^\varepsilon, \xi\lambda^\varepsilon))$$

and thus

$$\widetilde{p}(t, w) = b(t, w)(\tau - r(t, x, \xi)) \qquad |w| \lesssim \lambda^{-\varepsilon} \quad t \in I \tag{3.16}$$

where $0 \neq b \in S(1, g_\varepsilon)$, $r(t, x, \xi) = \lambda^{-\varepsilon} s(t\lambda^\varepsilon, x\lambda^\varepsilon, \xi\lambda^\varepsilon) \in S(\lambda^{-\varepsilon}, g_\varepsilon)$ when $|w| \lesssim \lambda^{-\varepsilon}$, and $t \in I$, $b = 1$ and $r = |\nabla \operatorname{Re} r| = 0$ on Γ. By condition (3.10) we find that

$$\left| d\nabla r \big|_L \right| \leq C \qquad \text{when } w = 0 \text{ and } t \in I \tag{3.17}$$

since r is constant in τ. Similarly, by conditions (3.11) and (3.12) we find that

$$|\nabla \operatorname{Im} r| \lesssim \lambda^{-14\varepsilon/3} \qquad \text{at } \Gamma \tag{3.18}$$

and

$$\left| d\nabla \operatorname{Im} r \big|_L \right| \leq C\lambda^{-4\varepsilon/3} \qquad \text{at } \Gamma \tag{3.19}$$

Extending by homogeneity, we obtain this preparation where the homogeneous distance to Γ is $\lesssim \lambda^{-\varepsilon}$, then (3.17)–(3.19) hold with the homogeneous gradient. In the following, we shall denote by Γ the rays in T^*X that goes through the semibicharacteristic. Recall that $\widetilde{p} = p/q$, where $q \in S(q, g_\varepsilon)$ when $|w| \lesssim \lambda^{-\varepsilon}$. By homogeneity we obtain from (3.16) that

$$b^{-1}q^{-1}p(t, x; \tau, \xi) = \tau - r(t, x, \xi)$$

where $b^{-1} \in S^0_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$, $q^{-1} \in S^\varepsilon_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ and $\tau - r \in S^{1-\varepsilon}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ when $|\xi| \cong \lambda$ and the homogeneous distance d to Γ is less than $c\lambda^{-\varepsilon}$ for some $c > 0$. In fact, in homogeneous coordinates, this means that $b^{-1} \in S(1, g_\varepsilon)$, $q^{-1} \in S(\lambda^\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon)$ and $r \in S(\lambda^{1-\varepsilon}, g_\varepsilon)$ when $|\xi| \cong \lambda$.

Next we take a homogeneous cut-off function $\chi \in S^0_{1,0}$ supported where $d \lesssim \lambda^{-\varepsilon}$ so that $b \geq c_0 > 0$ in $\operatorname{supp} \chi$ and $\chi = 1$ when $d \leq c\lambda^{-\varepsilon}$ for some $c > 0$, then $\chi \in S^0_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ uniformly when $|\xi| \cong \lambda$. We let $B = \chi b^{-1}q^{-1} \in S^\varepsilon_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ uniformly when $|\xi| \cong \lambda$ and we compose the corresponding pseudodifferential operator $B \in \Psi^0_{1,0}$ with P^*. Since $P^* \in \Psi^1_{1,0}$ we obtain an asymptotic expansion of BP^* in $S^{1+\varepsilon-j(1-\varepsilon)}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ for $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ when $|\xi| \cong \lambda$. But actually the symbol is in a better class. The principal symbol is

$$(\tau - r(t, x, \xi))\chi \in S^{1-\varepsilon}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon} \qquad |\xi| \cong \lambda$$

and the calculus gives that the homogeneous term is equal to

$$\frac{i}{2}H_p(\chi b^{-1}q^{-1}) + \chi b^{-1}q^{-1}p_0 \tag{3.20}$$

where p_0 is the homogeneous term of the expansion of P^*. As before, we shall use homogeneous coordinates. Then Proposition 3.1 gives $p = q\widetilde{p} \in S(q\lambda^{-\varepsilon}, g_\varepsilon)$ when $|\xi| \cong \lambda$ and since $\chi b^{-1}q^{-1} \in S(q^{-1}, g_\varepsilon)$ we find that the terms in (3.20) are in $S(\lambda^\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon)$ when $d \lesssim \lambda^{-\varepsilon}$. In fact, since $\partial p \in S(q, g_\varepsilon)$ we have $H_p q^{-1} \in S(\lambda^\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon)$ when $d \lesssim \lambda^{-\varepsilon}$. The value of H_p at Γ is equal to $q\partial_t$ modulo terms that are $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-14\varepsilon/3})$ by (3.18) so the value of (3.20) is equal to

$$\frac{1}{2i}\partial_t q/q + p_0/q = \frac{D_t|\nabla p|}{2|\nabla p|} + \frac{p_0}{|\nabla p|} \qquad \text{at } \Gamma \tag{3.21}$$

modulo bounded terms. Here $|\nabla p| = \sqrt{|\partial_x p|^2/|\xi|^2 + |\partial_\xi p|^2}$ is the homogeneous gradient, and the error of this approximation is bounded by $\lambda^{2\varepsilon}$ times the homogeneous distance d to Γ. Observe that $p_0/|\nabla p|$ is equal to the normalized subprincipal symbol of P^* on $S^*\mathbf{R}^n$ given by (3.6). This preparation can be done when $|\xi| \cong \lambda$ and the homogeneous distance to Γ is less than $c\lambda^{-\varepsilon}$, but we have to estimate the error terms.

Definition 3.2. *For $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$ and $R \in \Psi^\mu_{\varrho,\delta}$, where $\varrho > \varepsilon$ and $\delta < 1 - \varepsilon$, we say that $T^*X \ni (x_0, \xi_0) \notin \mathrm{WF}_\varepsilon(R)$ if the symbol of R is $\mathcal{O}(|\xi|^{-N})$, $\forall\, N$, when the homogeneous distance to the ray $\{\, (x_0, \varrho\xi_0) : \ \varrho \in \mathbf{R}_+ \,\}$ is less than $c|\xi|^{-\varepsilon}$ for some $c > 0$.*

By the calculus, this means that there exists $A \in \Psi^0_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ so that $A \geq c > 0$ in a neighborhood of the ray such that $AR \in \Psi^{-N}$ for any N. This neighborhood is in fact the points with homogeneous distance $d \lesssim |\xi|^\varepsilon$, thus the points in a fixed g_ε neighborhood when $\lambda \cong |\xi|$. It also follows from the calculus that this definition is invariant under composition with classical pseudodifferential operators and conjugation with elliptic homogeneous Fourier integral operators since the conjugated symbol is given by an asymptotic expansion by the conditions on ϱ and δ. We also have that $\mathrm{WF}_\varepsilon(R) \subset \mathrm{WF}(R)$ when $R \in \Psi^\mu_{\varrho,\delta}$.

Now we can use the Malgrange division theorem in order to make the lower order terms independent on τ when $d \lesssim \lambda^{-\varepsilon}$, starting with the subprincipal symbol $\widetilde{p}_0 \in S^\varepsilon_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ of BP^* given by (3.20). Then restricting to $|\xi| = 1$ and rescaling as before so that $Q_0(t,w) = \lambda^{-\varepsilon}\widetilde{p}_0(t\lambda^{-\varepsilon}, w\lambda^{-\varepsilon})$ we obtain that

$$Q_0(t,w) = \widetilde{c}(t,w)(\tau - s(t,x,\xi)) + \widetilde{q}_0(t,x,\xi) \qquad |w| \lesssim 1 \quad t \in I_\varepsilon$$

where s is given by (3.15), and $\widetilde{c}$ and $\widetilde{q}_0$ are uniformly in C^∞. This can be done locally and by a partition of unity for $t \in I_\varepsilon$. We find in the original coordinates that

$$\widetilde{p}_0(t,w) = c(t,w)(\tau - r(t,x,\xi)) + q_0(t,x,\xi) \qquad d \lesssim \lambda^{-\varepsilon} \quad t \in I \tag{3.22}$$

where $q_0(t,w) = \lambda^\varepsilon \widetilde{q}_0(t\lambda^\varepsilon, w\lambda^\varepsilon) \in S(\lambda^\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon)$ and $c(t,w) = \lambda^{2\varepsilon}\widetilde{c}(t\lambda^\varepsilon, w\lambda^\varepsilon) \in S(\lambda^{2\varepsilon}, g_\varepsilon)$. By using a homogeneous partition of unity, we obtain (3.22) uniformly when the homogeneous distance to Γ is $\lesssim \lambda^{-\varepsilon}$. By homogeneity we find $c \in S^{2\varepsilon-1}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ and $q_0 \in S^\varepsilon_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ when $|\xi| \cong \lambda$, and we have $q_0 = \widetilde{p}_0$ at Γ. Now the composition of the operators having symbols c and $\tau - r$ gives error terms that are in $S^{3\varepsilon-1}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ when $|\xi| \cong \lambda$. Thus if $\varepsilon < 1/3$ then by multiplication with an pseudodifferential operator with symbol $1 - c$ we can make the subprincipal symbol independent of τ. By iterating this procedure we can successively make any lower order terms independent of τ when the homogeneous distance d to Γ is less than $c\lambda^{-\varepsilon}$. By applying the cut-off function χ we obtain the following result.

Proposition 3.3. *Assume that* (2.3), (2.4), (2.8), (2.11), (2.13) *and* (2.19) *hold uniformly for* $\Gamma = \Gamma_j$, $L = L_j$ *and* $\lambda = \lambda_j$ *satisfying* (3.4) *for some* $\varepsilon > 0$. *By conjugating with a uniformly bounded elliptic homogeneous Fourier integral operator we may assume that* $m = 1$, $a_j \equiv 1$ *and* Γ *is given by* (3.9). *If* $0 < \varepsilon < 1/3$ *then by multiplying with a homogeneous elliptic operator* $B \in \Psi^0_{1,0}$ *we obtain that* $BP^* = Q + R \in \Psi^1_{1,0}$ *where* $\Gamma \bigcap \mathrm{WF}_\varepsilon(R) = \emptyset$, *and the symbol of* Q *is equal to*

$$\tau - r(t,x,\xi) + q_0(t,x,\xi) + r_0(t,x,\xi) \qquad \text{when } d \lesssim \lambda^{-\varepsilon} \text{ and } t \in I \tag{3.23}$$

Here r *is homogeneous of degree* 1 *and* q_0 *is homogeneous of degree* 0 *in* ξ. *We have* $r \in S^{1-\varepsilon}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$, $q_0 \in S^\varepsilon_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ *and* $r_0 \in S^{3\varepsilon-1}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ *uniformly when* $d \lesssim \lambda^{-\varepsilon} \cong |\xi|^{-\varepsilon}$. *We also have* $r = |\nabla \operatorname{Re} r| = 0$, $\nabla \operatorname{Im} r = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-14\varepsilon/3})$, $d\nabla \operatorname{Re} r\big|_L = \mathcal{O}(1)$ *and* $d\nabla \operatorname{Im} r\big|_L = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-4\varepsilon/3})$

on Γ. *We find that* q_0 *is equal to*

$$\frac{D_t|\nabla p(t,0)|}{2|\nabla p(t,0)|}+\frac{p_0(t,0)}{|\nabla p(t,0)|}+\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{2\varepsilon}d+1)\qquad \textit{when } d\lesssim\lambda^{-\varepsilon}\cong|\xi|^{-\varepsilon} \tag{3.24}$$

where d *is the homogeneous distance to* Γ *and* $|\nabla p|=\sqrt{|\partial_x p|^2/|\xi|^2+|\partial_\xi p|^2}$ *is the homogeneous gradient of* p.

We shall apply the operator in Proposition 3.3 on oscillatory solutions having frequencies of size λ, see Proposition 3.5. Observe also that the integration of the term $D_t|\nabla p(t,0)|/2|\nabla p(t,0)|$ in (3.24) will give terms that are

$$\mathcal{O}(\log(|\nabla p(t,0)|))=\mathcal{O}(|\log(\lambda)|+1)$$

which do not affect condition (2.19).

Recall that L is a smooth section of Lagrangean spaces $L(w)\subset T_w\Sigma\subset T_w(T^*\mathbf{R}^n)$, $w\in\Gamma$, such that the linearization of the Hamilton vector field $H_{\operatorname{Re}p}$ is in TL at Γ. Here $\Sigma=(\operatorname{Re}p)^{-1}(0)$ and $T_w\Sigma=\operatorname{Ker}d\operatorname{Re}p(w)$ where $d\operatorname{Re}p(w)\neq0$ for $w\in\Gamma$. By Proposition 3.3 we may assume that $\Gamma=\{\,(t,0;0,\xi_0):\ t\in I\,\}$, $0\in I$, and we may parametrize $L(t)=L(w)$ where $w=(t,0,\xi_0)$ for $t\in I$. Now since $T^*\mathbf{R}^n$ is a linear space, we may identify the fiber of $T_w(T^*\mathbf{R}^n)$ with $T^*\mathbf{R}^n$. Since $L(w)\subset T_w\Sigma$ and $w\in\Gamma$ we find that $d\tau=0$ in $L(w)$. Since $L(w)$ is Lagrangean, we find that t lines are parallel to $L(w)$. By choosing symplectic coordinates in (x,ξ) we obtain that $L(0)=\{\,(s,y;0,0):\ (s,y)\in\mathbf{R}^n\,\}$, then by conditions (3.17) and (3.19) we find that $\partial_x\nabla r(0,0,\xi_0)$ is uniformly bounded. Since $d\tau=0$ on $L(t)$ and $L(t)$ is a Lagrangean we find for small t by continuity that

$$L(t)=\{\,(s,y;0,A(t)y):\ (s,y)\in\mathbf{R}^n\,\} \tag{3.25}$$

where $A(t)$ is real, continuous and symmetric for $t\in I$ and $A(0)=0$. Since the linearization of the Hamilton vector field $H_{\operatorname{Re}p}$ at Γ is tangent to L, we find that L is parallel under the flow of that linearization. Since $L(t)$ is Lagrangean it is only the restriction of the second order Taylor expansion of $r(t,w)$ to $L(t)$ that determines the evolution of $t\mapsto L(t)$. For (3.25) this restriction is given by the second order Taylor expansion of

$$R(t,x)=\operatorname{Re}r(t,x,\xi_0+A(t)x)$$

thus $\partial_x^2R(t,0)$ is uniformly bounded by condition (2.7). The linearized Hamilton vector field is

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t+\langle\partial_x^2R(t,0)x,\partial_\xi\rangle=\partial_t+\langle\big(&\partial_x^2\operatorname{Re}r(t,0,\xi_0)+\partial_x\partial_\xi\operatorname{Re}r(t,0,\xi_0)A\\&+A\partial_x\partial_\xi\operatorname{Re}r(t,0,\xi_0)+A\partial_\xi^2\operatorname{Re}r(t,0,\xi_0)A\big)x,\partial_\xi\rangle\end{aligned}$$

Applying this on $\xi - A(t)x$, which vanishes identically on $L(t)$ for $t \in I$, we obtain that the evolution of $L(t)$ is given by

$$A'(t) = \partial_x^2 \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,\xi_0) + \partial_x\partial_\xi \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,\xi_0)A(t) + A(t)\partial_x\partial_\xi \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,\xi_0) + A(t)\partial_\xi^2 \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,\xi_0)A(t) \tag{3.26}$$

with $A(t) = 0$. This is locally uniquely solvable and the right-hand side is uniformly bounded as long as A is bounded. Observe that by uniqueness, $A(t) \equiv 0$ if and only if $\partial_x^2 \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,\xi_0) \equiv 0$, $\forall\, t$. But since (3.26) is non-linear, the solution could become unbounded if $\partial_x^2 \operatorname{Re} r \neq 0$ and $\partial_\xi^2 \operatorname{Re} r \neq 0$ so that $\|A(s)\| \to \infty$ as $s \to t_1 \in I$. This means that the angle between $L(t) = \{\,(s,y;0,A(t)y) :\ (s,y) \in \mathbf{R}^n\,\}$ and the vertical space $\{\,(s,0;0,\eta) : (s,\eta) \in \mathbf{R}^n\,\}$ goes to zero.

In general, since we identify the fiber of $T_w(T^*\mathbf{R}^n)$ with $T^*\mathbf{R}^n$ we may define $R(t,x,\xi)$ for each t so that

$$R(t,x,\xi) = \operatorname{Re} r(t,x,\xi_0+\xi) \quad \text{when } (0,x;0,\xi) \in L(t) \tag{3.27}$$

Then $R = \operatorname{Re} r$ on L and we find that

$$\tau - \langle R(t)z, z\rangle/2 \in C^\infty \tag{3.28}$$

if $z = (x,\xi)$ and $R(t) = \partial_z^2 R(t,0,0)\big|_L(t)$. Observe that we find from (3.17) that (3.28) is uniformly in C^∞ in z and uniformly in C^1 in t. We find that $R(0) = \partial_x^2 \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,\xi_0)$ and in general $R(t)$ is given by the right hand side of (3.26). Now we can complete t and (3.28) to a uniform homogeneous symplectic coordinates system so that $\Gamma = \{\,(t,0,\xi_0) :\ t \in I\,\}$ and $L(0) = \{\,(s,y;0,0) :\ (s,y) \in \mathbf{R}^n\,\}$. In fact, we may let x and ξ have the same values when $t = 0$ and clearly H_τ is is not changed on Γ since then $(x,\xi) = 0$. This is a uniformly bounded linear symplectic transformation in (x,ξ) which is uniformly C^1 in t. It is given by a uniformly bounded elliptic Fourier integral operator $F(t)$ on $\mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ which has uniformly bounded t derivative. We will call this type of Fourier integral operator a C^1 *section of Fourier integral operators on* $\mathbf{R}^{n-1}$. This will give uniformly bounded terms when we conjugate a first order differential operator in t with $F(t)$, for example the normal form which has symbol given by (3.23). For t close to 0 the section $F(t)$ is given by multiplication with $e^{i\langle A(t)x,x\rangle}$, where $A(t)$ solves (3.26). For general t we can put $F(t)$ on this form after a linear symplectic transformation in (x,ξ). Observe that $F(t)$ is continuous on local L^2 Sobolev spaces in x, uniformly in t, since it is continuous with respect to the norm $\|(1+|x|^2+|D|^2)^k u\|$, $\forall\ k$. In fact, it suffices to check this for the generators of the group of Fourier integral operators corresponding to linear symplectic transformations, which are given by the partial Fourier transforms, linear transformations in x and multiplication with $e^{i\langle Ax,x\rangle}$ where A is real and symmetric.

We find in the new coordinates that $p = \tau - r_1$, where $r_1(t,x,\xi)$ is independent of τ and satisfies $\partial_z^2 \operatorname{Re} r_1(t,0,0)\big|_L(t) \equiv 0$. This follows since

$$p(t,x;\tau,\xi) = \tau - \langle R(t)z, z\rangle/2 - r_1(t,x,\tau,\xi)$$

where $\partial_z^2 \operatorname{Re} r_1(t,0,0)\big|_L(t) \equiv 0$. We also have that $\partial_\tau r_1 = -\{\, t, r_1 \,\} = -\{\, t, r \,\} \equiv 0$, which is invariant under changes of symplectic coordinates. Similarly we find that the lower order terms $p_j(t,x,\xi)$ remain independent of τ for $j \le 0$. Since the evolution of L is determined by the second order derivatives of the principal symbol along L by Example 2.4, we find that $L(t) \equiv \{\, (t,x;0,0) :\ (t,x) \in \mathbf{R}^n \,\}$. Since L is a grazing Lagrangean space, the linearization of $H_{\operatorname{Re} p}$ at Γ is tangent to L. Thus $\partial_x \operatorname{Re} r_1(t,0,0) = 0$ and $\partial_x^2 \operatorname{Re} r_1(t,0,0) = 0$, and condition (3.19) gives that $\partial_{t,x} \nabla \operatorname{Im} r_1(t,0,0) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-4\varepsilon/3})$ for $t \in I$. Changing notation so that $r = r_1$ and $p(t,x;\tau,\xi) = \tau - r(t,x,\xi)$ we obtain the following result.

Proposition 3.4. *By conjugating with a uniformly bounded C^1 section of Fourier integral operators on $\mathbf{R}^{n-1}$, we may assume that the symplectic coordinates in Proposition 3.3 are chosen so that the grazing Lagrangean space $L(w) \equiv \{\, (t,x,0,0) :\ (t,x) \in \mathbf{R}^n \,\}$, $\forall\, w \in \Gamma$, which gives that $\partial_x^2 \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,\xi_0) \equiv 0$, $\partial_{t,x} \nabla \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,\xi_0) = \mathcal{O}(1)$, and $\partial_{t,x} \nabla \operatorname{Im} r(t,0,\xi_0) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-4\varepsilon/3})$ for $t \in I$.*

We shall apply the adjoint P^* of the operator on the form in Proposition 3.3 on approximate solutions on the form

$$u_\lambda(t,x) = \exp(i\lambda(\langle x,\xi_0\rangle + \omega(t,x))) \sum_{j=0}^{M} \varphi_j(t,x)\lambda^{-j\varrho} \tag{3.29}$$

where $|\xi_0| = 1$ and the phase function $\omega(t,\cdot) \in S(\lambda^{-7\varepsilon}, g_{3\varepsilon})$ is real valued such that $\partial_x^2 \omega(t,0) \equiv 0$ and the amplitudes $\varphi_j(t,x) \in S(1,g_\delta)$ has support where $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-\delta}$. Here $\delta \ge \varepsilon$ and ϱ are positive constants to be determined later. The phase function $\omega(t,x)$ will be constructed in Section 4, see Proposition 4.2. Observe that we have assumed that $\varepsilon < 1/3$ in Proposition 3.3, but we shall impose further restrictions on ε later on. We shall assume that $\varepsilon + \delta < 1$, then if $p(t,x,\xi) \in \Psi^{1-\varepsilon}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ when $|\xi| \cong \lambda$ we obtain the asymptotic expansion

$$\begin{aligned} &p(t,x,D_x)(\exp(i\lambda(\langle x,\xi_0\rangle + \omega(t,x)))\varphi(t,x)) \\ &\quad \sim \exp(i\lambda(\langle x,\xi_0\rangle + \omega(t,x))) \sum_\alpha \partial_\xi^\alpha p(t,x,\lambda(\xi_0 + \partial_x\omega(t,x)))\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\omega,\lambda,D)\varphi(t,x)/\alpha! \end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

where $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\omega,\lambda,D)\varphi(t,x) = D_y^\alpha(\exp(i\lambda\widetilde{\omega}(t,x,y))\varphi(t,y))\big|_{y=x}$ with

$$\widetilde{\omega}(t,x,y) = \omega(t,y) - \omega(t,x) + (x-y)\partial_x\omega(t,x)$$

and the error term is of the same size as the next term in the expansion. See for example Theorem 3.1 in [7, Chapter VI], which is for classical pseudodifferential operators, phase

functions and amplitudes, but the proof is easily adapted to the case when these depend uniformly on parameters. Observe that if $|\partial_x\omega| \ll 1$ then the expansion only involves the values of $p(t,x,\xi)$ where $|\xi| \cong \lambda$. Using this expansion we find that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3.31)\quad & P^*(t,x,D)(\exp(i\lambda(\langle x,\xi_0\rangle+\omega(t,x)))\varphi(t,x)) \\
&\sim \exp(i\lambda(\langle x,\xi_0\rangle+\omega(t,x)))\big(\lambda\partial_t\omega(t,x)-r(t,x,\lambda(\xi_0+\partial_x\omega))\varphi(t,x) \\
&+D_t\varphi(t,x)-\sum_j \partial_{\xi_j} r(t,x,\lambda(\xi_0+\partial_x\omega))D_{x_j}\varphi(t,x)+q_0(t,x,\lambda(\xi_0+\partial_x\omega))\varphi(t,x) \\
&+\sum_{jk}\partial_{\xi_j}\partial_{\xi_k} r(t,x,\lambda(\xi_0+\partial_x\omega))(D_{x_j}D_{x_k}\varphi(t,x)+i\lambda\varphi(t,x)D_{x_j}D_{x_k}\omega(t,x))/2+\dots\big)
\end{aligned}
$$

which gives an expansion in $S(\lambda^{1-\varepsilon-j(1-\delta-\varepsilon)},g_\delta)$, $j\ge 0$, if $\delta+\varepsilon<1$ and $\varepsilon\le 1/4$. In fact, since $|\xi|\cong\lambda$ every ξ derivative on terms in $S^{1-\varepsilon}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ gives a factor that is $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{\varepsilon-1})$ and every x derivative of φ gives a factor that is $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^\delta)$. A factor $\lambda D_x^\alpha\omega$ requires $|\alpha|\ge 2$ number of ξ derivatives of a term in the expansion of P^*, which gives a factor that is $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{1+(-7+3|\alpha|)\varepsilon+(1-|\alpha|)(1-\varepsilon)})=\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{(2-|\alpha|)(1-4\varepsilon)})$. Similarly, the expansion coming from terms in P^* that have symbols in $S^\varepsilon_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ gives an expansion in $S^{\varepsilon-j(1-\delta-\varepsilon)}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$, $j\ge 0$. Thus, if $\delta+\varepsilon<2/3$ and $\varepsilon\le 1/4$ then the terms in the expansion have negative powers of λ except the terms in (3.31), and for the last ones we find that

$$
(3.32)\qquad \sum_{jk}\partial_{\xi_j}\partial_{\xi_k} r(t,x,\lambda(\xi_0+\partial_x\omega))(D_{x_j}D_{x_k}\varphi+i\lambda\varphi D_{x_j}D_{x_k}\omega)=\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{2\delta+\varepsilon-1}+\lambda^{3\varepsilon-\delta})
$$

In fact, $\partial_{\xi_j}\partial_{\xi_k} r(t,x,\lambda(\xi_0+\partial_x\omega))=\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{\varepsilon-1})$ and $D_{x_j}D_{x_k}\omega=\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{2\varepsilon}d)$ when $\varphi\neq 0$, since we have $D_{x_j}D_{x_k}\omega=0$ when $x=0$, and $d=\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-\delta})$ in $\operatorname{supp}\varphi$.

The error terms in (3.32) are of equal size if $2\delta+\varepsilon-1=3\varepsilon-\delta$, thus $\delta=(1+2\varepsilon)/3\ge\varepsilon$ since $\varepsilon\le 1$. Then we obtain $3\varepsilon-\delta=(7\varepsilon-1)/3<0$ if $\varepsilon<1/7$, and we find $1-\delta-\varepsilon=(2-5\varepsilon)/3>1/3$ if $\varepsilon<1/5$. Thus we obtain the following result.

Proposition 3.5. *Assume that P^* is given by Proposition 3.3, $\omega(t,\cdot)\in S(\lambda^{-7\varepsilon},g_{3\varepsilon})$ is real valued with $\partial_x^2\omega(t,0)\equiv 0$, and $\varphi_j(t,x)\in S(1,g_\delta)$ has support where $|x|\lesssim\lambda^{-\delta}$ with positive δ and ε. If $\delta=(1+2\varepsilon)/3$ and $\varepsilon<1/7$, then* (3.31) *has an expansion in $S(\lambda^{1-\varepsilon-j(2-5\varepsilon)/3},g_\delta)$, $j\ge 0$, and is equal to*

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3.33)\quad & \exp(-i\lambda(\langle x,\xi_0\rangle+\omega(t,x)))P^*(t,x,D)(\exp(i\lambda(\langle x,\xi_0\rangle+\omega(t,x)))\varphi(t,x)) \\
&\sim(\lambda\partial_t\omega(t,x)-r(t,x,\lambda(\xi_0+\partial_x\omega)))\varphi(t,x) \\
&+D_t\varphi(t,x)-\sum_j\partial_{\xi_j} r(t,x,\lambda(\xi_0+\partial_x\omega))D_{x_j}\varphi(t,x)+q_0(t,x,\lambda(\xi_0+\partial_x\omega))\varphi(t,x)
\end{aligned}
$$

modulu terms that are $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{(7\varepsilon-1)/3})$.

In Section 5 we shall choose $\varepsilon=1/8$ which gives $\delta=5/12$, $(2-5\varepsilon)/3=11/24$ and $(7\varepsilon-1)/3=-1/24$, so we may take $\varrho=1/24$.

4. The eikonal equation

The first term in the expansion (3.33) gives the eikonal equation

$$\partial_t\omega - \operatorname{Re} r(t,x,\xi_0+\partial_x\omega) = 0 \qquad \omega(0,x) = 0 \tag{4.1}$$

since r is homogeneous of degree 1 in ξ by Proposition 3.3. We shall solve this equation approximatively after scaling. Since we only solve the real part it will be similar to the argument in [2]. We shall use homogeneous coordinates (t,x,ξ) so that $x=\xi=0$ at Γ and d the homogeneous distance to Γ, then $r\in S(\lambda^{-\varepsilon},g_\varepsilon)$ when $d\lesssim\lambda^{-\varepsilon}$ by Proposition 3.3. By Proposition 3.4 we may assume that $L(t)\equiv\{\,(t,x,0,0)\,\}$, $\forall\, t$, But actually, r is also in another symbol class by the following refinement of Proposition 3.3.

Proposition 4.1. *Assuming Propositions 3.3 and 3.4 we have*

$$r\in S(\lambda^{-7\varepsilon},\lambda^{6\varepsilon}(dt^2+|dx|^2)+\lambda^{8\varepsilon}d|\xi|^2)$$

when $|x|\lesssim\lambda^{-3\varepsilon}$, $|\xi|\lesssim\lambda^{-4\varepsilon}$ *and* $t\in I$.

Proof. Since $r\in S(\lambda^{-\varepsilon},g_\varepsilon)$ when $d\lesssim\lambda^{-\varepsilon}$ by Proposition 3.3, we find that

$$|\partial_{t,x}^\alpha\partial_\xi^\beta r|\lesssim\lambda^{(|\alpha|+|\beta|-1)\varepsilon}\lesssim\lambda^{(3|\alpha|+4|\beta|-7)\varepsilon} \qquad \text{when } d\lesssim\lambda^{-\varepsilon} \tag{4.2}$$

if and only $|\alpha|+|\beta|-1\le 3|\alpha|+4|\beta|-7$, i.e.,

$$2|\alpha|+3|\beta|\ge 6$$

Thus, we only have to check the cases $|\alpha|+|\beta|\le 2$ and $|\beta|\le 1$. Since the Lagrange remainder term is in the symbol class, we only have to check the derivatives at $x=\xi=0$. Then we obtain (4.2) since $r(t,0,0)=0$, $\partial r(t,0,0)=\partial\operatorname{Im} r(t,0,0)=\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-4\varepsilon})$ by (3.18), $\partial_{t,x}\partial_\xi r(t,0,\xi_0)=\mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\partial_{t,x}^2 r(t,0,0)=\partial_{t,x}^2\operatorname{Im} r(t,0,0)=\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-\varepsilon})$ by (3.17) and (3.19). □

Observe that $\partial\operatorname{Im} r=\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-14\varepsilon/3})$ and $\partial_{t,x}\partial\operatorname{Im} r=\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-4\varepsilon/3})$ at Γ, which is better than the symbol estimates and will be important in the proof of Proposition 5.2. Next, we scale and put $(x,\xi)=(y\lambda^{-3\varepsilon},\eta\lambda^{-4\varepsilon})$. Then

$$f(t,y,\eta)=\lambda^{7\varepsilon}r(t,y\lambda^{-3\varepsilon},\eta\lambda^{-4\varepsilon})\in C^\infty \qquad \text{uniformly when } |y|+|\eta|\le c \tag{4.3}$$

and by we put $w(t,y)=\lambda^{7\varepsilon}\omega(t,y\lambda^{-3\varepsilon})\in C^\infty$, which gives

$$\partial_t w-\operatorname{Re} f(t,y,\partial_y w)=0 \qquad w(0,x)=0 \tag{4.4}$$

when $|y|+|\eta|\le c$. We can solve (4.4) by solving the Hamilton-Jacobi equations:

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t y=-\partial_\eta\operatorname{Re} f(t,y,\eta)\\ \partial_t\eta=\partial_y\operatorname{Re} f(t,y,\eta)\end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

with initial values $(y(0),\eta(0))=(z,0)$. Since we have uniform bounds on f, we find that (4.5) has a uniformly bounded C^∞ solution $(y(t,z),\eta(t,z))$ if $(z,0)$ is uniformly bounded.

Letting $\partial_y w(t,y(t,z)) = \eta(t,z)$ and $\partial_t w(t,y(t,z)) = \operatorname{Re} f(t,y(t,z),\eta(t,z))$ we obtain the solution $w(t,y)$ with $w(0,y) = 0$.

Since $f = \nabla \operatorname{Re} f = 0$ on Γ we find that $w = \partial_t y = \partial_t \eta = 0$ when $y = \eta = 0$, so by uniqueness $\partial_t w(t,0) \equiv \partial_y w(t,0) \equiv 0$. In the original coordinates this means that if $x(0) = x_0 = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3\varepsilon})$ and $\xi(0) = 0$ then we find $x(t,x_0) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3\varepsilon})$ and $\xi(t,x_0) = \partial_x \omega(t,x) = \lambda^{-4\varepsilon}\partial_x w(t,\lambda^{3\varepsilon}x) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-4\varepsilon})$ for any $t \in I$. The scaling also gives that $\partial_x^\alpha \omega = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{(-7+3|\alpha|)\varepsilon})$ when $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-3\varepsilon}$. Since $\omega(t,0) \equiv 0$ we obtain that $\omega = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-7\varepsilon})$ when $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-3\varepsilon}$, thus

$$\omega(t,x) = \lambda^{-7\varepsilon} w(t,\lambda^{3\varepsilon}x) \in S(\lambda^{-7\varepsilon}, g_{3\varepsilon}) \tag{4.6}$$

and we have $\partial_x \omega(t,0) = 0$.

Now by differentiating (4.1) twice we find that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t \partial_x^2 \omega(t,0) = \partial_x\partial_\xi \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,\xi_0)\partial_x^2\omega(t,0) + \partial_x^2\omega(t,0)\partial_\xi\partial_x \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,\xi_0) \\ + \partial_x^2\omega(t,0)\partial_\xi^2 \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,\xi_0)\partial_x^2\omega(t,0)\end{aligned}$$

because $\partial_x\omega(t,0) = 0$, $\partial \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,\xi_0) = 0$ and $\partial_x^2 \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,\xi_0) = 0$. Since $\partial_x^2\omega(0,x) \equiv 0$ we find by uniqueness that $\partial_x^2\omega(t,0) \equiv 0$. This gives that $\partial_t\omega = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-7\varepsilon})$ when $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-3\varepsilon}$, and we obtain the following result.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1/3$, and assume that Propositions 3.3 and 3.4 hold. Then there exists a real $\omega(t,\cdot) \in S(\lambda^{-7\varepsilon}, g_{3\varepsilon})$ satisfying $\partial_t\omega = \lambda^{-1}\operatorname{Re} r(t,x,\lambda(\xi_0 + \partial_x\omega))$ when $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-3\varepsilon}$ and $t \in I$ such that $\omega(t,0) \equiv 0$ and $\partial_x^2\omega(t,0) \equiv 0$. If $3\varepsilon \le \delta \le 4\varepsilon$ we find that the values of $(t,x;\lambda\partial_t\omega(t,x),\lambda(\xi_0 + \partial_x\omega(t,x)))$ have homogeneous distance $\lesssim \lambda^{-\delta}$ to the rays through Γ when $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-\delta}$ and $t \in I$.*

5. The transport equations

The next term in (3.33) is the transport equation, which by homogeneity is equal to

$$D_p\varphi + q_0\varphi + ir_0\varphi = 0 \qquad \text{at } \Gamma = \{\,(t,0;0,\xi_0) :\ t \in I\,\} \tag{5.1}$$

where $D_p = D_t - \sum_j \partial_{\xi_j} r(t,x,\xi_0 + \partial_x\omega(t,x))D_{x_j} = D_t$ when $x = 0$,

$$r_0(t,x) = \lambda \operatorname{Im} r(t,x,\xi_0 + \partial_x\omega(t,x)) \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$q_0(t) = D_t|\nabla p(t,0,\xi_0)|/2|\nabla p(t,0,\xi_0)| + p_0(t,0,\xi_0)/|\nabla p(t,0,\xi_0)| = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^\varepsilon) \tag{5.3}$$

modulo $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{2\varepsilon}|x| + 1)$ when $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-\varepsilon}$ by (3.24). Here $\omega(t,\cdot) \in S(\lambda^{-7\varepsilon}, g_{3\varepsilon})$ is given by Proposition 4.2. Since the transport equation is given by a complex vector field, the treatment is different to the one in [2]. But essentially we shall treat the complex part of the transport equation as a perturbation of the real part.

Lemma 5.1. *If $3\varepsilon \leq \delta \leq 7\varepsilon/2$ then we have that*

$$D_p = D_t + \sum_j \langle a_j(t)\cdot x\rangle D_{x_j} + R(t,x,D)$$

where $\mathbf{R}^{n-1} \ni a_j(t) = \mathcal{O}(1)$ is real and $R(t,x,D)$ is a first order differential operator in x with coefficients that are $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{3\varepsilon-2\delta})$ when $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-\delta}$.

Proof. As before we shall use homogeneous coordinates so that $\xi_0 = 0$ and

$$r(t,x,\xi) \in S(\lambda^{-\varepsilon}, g_\varepsilon) \bigcap S(\lambda^{-7\varepsilon}, \lambda^{6\varepsilon}(dt^2 + |dx|^2) + \lambda^{8\varepsilon}|d\xi|^2) \tag{5.4}$$

when $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-3\varepsilon}$, $|\xi| \lesssim \lambda^{-4\varepsilon}$ and $t \in I$ by Proposition 4.2. Since $\partial_x^2\omega(t,0) \equiv 0$ we have from Taylor's formula that $a_j(t) = -\partial_x\partial_{\xi_j} \operatorname{Re} r(t,0,0)$ which is uniformly bounded by (3.17). The coefficients of the error term R are given by $\partial_\xi \operatorname{Im} r$ and the second order Lagrange remainder term of the coefficients of $\partial_\xi \operatorname{Re} r$. By Propositions 3.3, 3.4 and 4.2 we find from Taylor's formula that

$$\partial_\xi \operatorname{Im} r(t,x,\partial_x\omega(t,x)) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-4\varepsilon} + \lambda^{-\varepsilon}|x| + \lambda^{3\varepsilon}|x|^2) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{3\varepsilon-2\delta})$$

when $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-\delta}$ since $\delta \leq 7\varepsilon/3$. In fact, $\partial_\xi \operatorname{Im} r = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-14\varepsilon/3})$ and $\partial_x\partial_\xi \operatorname{Im} r = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-4\varepsilon/3})$ at Γ, $\partial_\xi^2 r = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{\varepsilon})$, $\partial^3 r = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{2\varepsilon})$ and $\partial_x\omega(t,x) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{2\varepsilon}|x|^2) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-4\varepsilon})$ when $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-\delta}$ since $\delta \geq 3\varepsilon$. Similarly we find that the second order Lagrange remainder term of the coefficients of $\partial_\xi \operatorname{Re} r$ are $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{2\varepsilon}(|x|^2 + \lambda^{4\varepsilon}|x|^4)) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{2\varepsilon-2\delta})$ when $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-\delta} \ll \lambda^{-\varepsilon}$, which proves the result. □

We also have to estimate the term $r_0(t,x) = \lambda \operatorname{Im} r(t,x,\partial_x\omega(t,x))$ which in fact is bounded according to the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *If $\varepsilon = 1/8$ and $\delta = (1+2\varepsilon)/3 = 5/12$ then $r_0(t,x) \in S(1,g_\delta)$ for $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-\delta}$ and $t \in I$.*

Observe that we need that $\varepsilon < 1/7$ and $\delta = (1+2\varepsilon)/3$ in order to use the expansion of Proposition 3.5, and when $\varepsilon = 1/8$ we get $\delta = 10\varepsilon/3$.

Proof. We shall as before use scaling $(t,x,\xi) = (s\lambda^{-3\varepsilon}, y\lambda^{-3\varepsilon}, \eta\lambda^{-4\varepsilon})$, and write $f(s,y,\eta) = \lambda^{7\varepsilon} r(t,x,\xi) \in C^\infty$ and $\partial_y w(s,y) = \lambda^{4\varepsilon}\partial_x\omega(t,x) \in C^\infty$ uniformly when $|y| \leq c$ and $t \in I$, which we will assume in the following. This gives

$$r_0(t,x) = \lambda^{1-7\varepsilon} \operatorname{Im} f(s,y,\partial_y w(t,y)) \tag{5.5}$$

and we shall show that $F(s,y) = \operatorname{Im} f(s,y,\partial_y w(t,y)) \in S(\lambda^{-\varepsilon}, g_\varrho)$ when $|y| \leq c\lambda^{-\varrho}$, where $\varrho = \delta - 3\varepsilon = \varepsilon/3$. Since $\varepsilon = 1/8$ we find $-\varepsilon = 7\varepsilon - 1$, so this will give the result. Taylor's formula gives

$$\begin{aligned} F(s,y) = {} & \partial_y \operatorname{Im} f(s,0,0)y + \langle \partial_y^2 \operatorname{Im} f(s,0,0)y, y\rangle/2 \\ & + \partial_\eta \operatorname{Im} f(s,0,0)\langle \partial_y^3 w(s,0)y, y\rangle/2 + R(s,y) \qquad |y| \leq c\lambda^{-\varrho} \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

where $R(s,y) \in C^\infty$ uniformly and vanishes of order 3 at $y=0$ since $f(s,0,0) \equiv 0$ and $\partial_y^2 w(s,0) = 0$ when $t \in I$ by Propositions 3.4 and 4.2. Thus

$$R(s,y) = \mathcal{O}(|y|^3) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-3\varrho}) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-\varepsilon}) \quad \text{when } |y| \le c\lambda^{-\varrho}$$

since $-3\varrho = -\varepsilon$. Now one loses at most a factor $\mathcal{O}(y) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-\varrho}) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-\varepsilon/3})$ when taking a derivative of $R(t,y)$, which gives a factor $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{\varepsilon/3})$. Thus we find that $R(s,y) \in S(\lambda^{-\varepsilon}, g_\varrho)$.

It remains to consider the first three terms in (5.6) and since $\varrho = \varepsilon/3$ it suffices to consider derivatives of order less than 3 at $y=0$. Since $\partial_y^3 w(s,0) \in C^\infty$ uniformly we only have to estimate $\partial_\eta \operatorname{Im} f(s,0,0)$ and $\partial_{s,y}^k \operatorname{Im} f(s,0,0)$ when $k \le 2$. We obtain from (3.18) that

$$\partial_\eta \operatorname{Im} f(s,0,0) = \lambda^{3\varepsilon} \partial_\xi \operatorname{Im} r(t,0,0) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-5\varepsilon/3}) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-\varepsilon/3}) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-\varepsilon+2\varrho})$$

Similarly, (3.18) gives

$$\partial_{s,y} \operatorname{Im} f(s,0,0) = \lambda^{4\varepsilon} \partial_{t,x} \operatorname{Im} r(t,0,0) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-2\varepsilon/3}) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-\varepsilon+\varrho})$$

and (3.19) gives that $\partial_{s,y}^2 \operatorname{Im} f(s,0,0) = \lambda^\varepsilon \partial_{t,x}^2 \operatorname{Im} r(t,0,0) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-\varepsilon/3}) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-\varepsilon+2\varrho})$. □

By a change of t variable we may assume that (3.2) and (3.5) hold with the integration starting at $t=0$. We obtain new variables y in $\mathbf{R}^{n-1}$ by solving

$$\partial_t z_j = \langle a_j(t), z\rangle \qquad z_j(0) = x_j \qquad \forall\, j$$

Then $D_t + \sum_j \langle a_j(t), x\rangle D_{x_j}$ is changed into D_t but $D_{x_j} = D_{z_j}$ is unchanged, and we will for simplicity keep the notation (t,x). The change of variables is uniformly bounded since $a_j = \mathcal{O}(1)$, so it preserves the neighborhoods $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-\nu}$ and symbol classes $S(\lambda^\mu, g_\nu)$, $\forall\, \mu,\, \nu$. We shall then solve the approximate transport equation

$$D_t\varphi + (q_0(t) + ir_0(t,x))\varphi = 0 \tag{5.7}$$

where $\varphi(0,x) \in S(1,g_\delta)$ is supported where $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-\delta}$, $q_0(t)$ is given by (5.3) and r_0 by (5.2). If $\lambda^{-\delta} \ll \lambda^{-3\varepsilon}$ then by Lemma 5.1 the approximation errors will be in $S(\lambda^{3\varepsilon-\delta}, g_\delta)$, so we will assume $\delta > 3\varepsilon$. In fact, since ∂_x maps $S(1,g_\delta)$ into $S(\lambda^\delta, g_\delta)$, we find $R(t,x,D_x)\varphi_0 \in S(\lambda^{3\varepsilon-\delta}, g_\delta)$ when $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-\delta}$. We find from Proposition 3.1 that $q_0 \in S(\lambda^\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon)$, and if $\varepsilon = 1/8$ and $\delta = (1+2\varepsilon)/3$ then we find from Lemma 5.2 that $r_0 \in S(1,g_\delta)$ when $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-\delta}$ and $t \in I$.

If we choose the initial data $\varphi(0,x) = \phi_0(x) = \phi(\lambda^\delta x)$, where $\phi \in C_0^\infty$ satisfies $\phi(0) = 1$, we obtain the solution

$$\varphi(t,x) = \phi_0(x) \exp(-iB(t,x)) \tag{5.8}$$

where $\partial_t B(t,x) = q_0(t) + ir_0(t,x)$ and $B(0,x) = 0$. We find that $\exp(-iB(t,x)) \in S(1,g_\delta)$ since condition (3.2) holds with $a_j \equiv 1$, $\partial_t B(t,x) = q_0(t) + ir_0(t,x) \in S(\lambda^\varepsilon, g_\varepsilon) + S(1,g_\delta) \subset$

$S(\lambda^\delta, g_\delta)$ and

$$\partial_x B(t,x) = i\int_0^t \partial_x r_0(s,x)\,ds \in S(\lambda^\delta, g_\delta)$$

by Proposition 3.1 and Lemma 5.2. We find that $|\varphi(t,x)| \le C|\phi(\lambda^\delta x)|$ so $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-\delta}$ in $\operatorname{supp}\varphi$, which also holds in the original x coordinates. Observe that $D_x^\alpha\varphi = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{\delta|\alpha|})$, $\forall\,\alpha$, and we have from the transport equation that $D_t\varphi = -(q_0 + ir_0)\varphi$. Since $q_0 + ir_0 \in S(\lambda^\varepsilon, g_\delta)$, we find by induction that $\varphi \in S(1, g_\delta)$.

After solving the eikonal equation and the approximate transport equation, we find from Proposition 3.5 that the terms in the expansion (3.33) are $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{(7\varepsilon-1)/3}) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-\varepsilon})$, if $\varepsilon < 1/7$ and $\delta = (1+2\varepsilon)/3 < 4\varepsilon$, and all the terms contain the factor $\exp(-iB(t,x))$. We take $\varepsilon = 1/8$, $\delta = 5/12$ which gives $(7\varepsilon-1)/3 = 3\varepsilon - \delta = -1/24$. Then the expansion in Proposition 3.5 is in multiples of $\lambda^{-11/24}$, and since the error terms of (3.33) are $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/24})$ we will take $\varrho = 1/24$ and $\varphi_0 = \varphi$ in the definition of u_λ given by (3.29).

The approximate transport equation for φ_1 in (3.29) is

$$D_t\varphi_1 + (q_0(t) + ir_0(t,x))\varphi_1 = \lambda^{1/24}R_1\exp(-iB(t,x)) \qquad \text{at } \Gamma \tag{5.9}$$

where R_1 is uniformly bounded in the symbol class $S(\lambda^{-1/24}, g_{5/12})$ and supported where $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-5/12}$. In fact, R_1 contains both the error terms from the transport equation (5.1) for φ_0 and the terms that are $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/24})$ in (3.33), and all the terms contain the factor $\exp(-iB(t,x))$. By putting

$$\varphi_1(t,x) = \exp(-iB(t,x))\phi_1(t,x)$$

the transport equation reduces to solving

$$D_t\phi_1 = \lambda^{1/24}R_1 \tag{5.10}$$

with initial values $\phi_1(0,x) = 0$. As before, it follows that $\phi_1 \in S(1, g_{5/12})$ with support where $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-5/12}$.

Similarly, the general term in the expansion (3.29) is $\varphi_k\lambda^{-k/24}$ where φ_k shall solve the approximate transport equation

$$D_t\varphi_k + (q_0(t) + ir_0(t,x))\varphi_k = \lambda^{k/24}R_k\exp(iB(t,x)) \qquad k \ge 1 \tag{5.11}$$

with R_k is uniformly bounded in the symbol class $S(\lambda^{-k/24}, g_{5/12})$ and is supported where $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-5/12}$. In fact, R_k contains the error terms from the transport equation (5.1) for φ_{k-1} and also the terms that are $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-k/24})$ in (3.33). Taking $\varphi_k = \exp(-iB(t,x))\phi_k$ we obtain the equation

$$D_t\phi_k = \lambda^{k/24}R_k \in S(1, g_{5/12}) \tag{5.12}$$

with initial values $\phi_k(0,x) = 0$, which can be solved with $\phi_k \in S(1, g_{5/12})$ uniformly having support where $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-5/12}$. Proceeding we obtain an solution modulo $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-N/24})$ for any N.

Proposition 5.3. *Assuming Propositions 3.3 and 3.4 and choosing* $\varepsilon = 1/8$, $\delta = 5/12$ *and* $\varrho = 1/24$ *we can solve the transport equations* (5.1) *and* (5.11) *with* $\varphi_k \in S(1, g_{5/12})$ *having support where* $|x| \lesssim \lambda^{-5/12}$, $\forall\, k$, *such that* $\varphi_0(0,0) = 1$ *and* $\varphi_k(0,x) \equiv 0$, $k \geq 1$.

Now, we get localization in x from the initial values and the transport equation. To get localization in t we use that $\operatorname{Im} B(t) \leq C$ so that $\operatorname{Re}(-iB) \leq C$. Near $\partial\Gamma$ we may assume that $\operatorname{Re}(-iB(t)) \ll -\log\lambda$ in an interval of length $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-\varepsilon}) = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1/8})$ by (3.3)–(3.5). Thus by applying a cut-off function $\chi(t) \in S(1, \lambda^{1/4}dt^2) \subset S(1, g_{5/12})$ such that $\chi(0) = 1$ and $\chi'(t)$ is supported where (3.5) holds, i.e., where $\varphi_k = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-N})$, $\forall\, k$, we obtain a solution modulo $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-N})$ for any N. In fact, if u_λ is defined by (3.29) and Q by Proposition 3.3 then

$$Q\chi u_\lambda = \chi Q u_\lambda + [Q,\chi]u_\lambda$$

where $[Q,\chi] = D_t\chi$ is supported where $u_\lambda = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-N})$ which gives terms that are $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-N})$, $\forall\, N$. Thus, by solving the eikonal equation (4.1) for ω and the transport equations (5.11) for φ_k for $k \leq 24N$, we obtain that $Q\chi u_\lambda = \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-N})$ for any N and we get the following remark.

Remark 5.4. *In Proposition 5.3 we may assume that* $\varphi_k(t,x) = \phi_k(\lambda^{5/12}t, \lambda^{5/12}x) \in S(1, g_{5/12})$, $k \geq 0$, *with* $\phi_k \in C_0^\infty$ *having support where* $|x| \lesssim 1$ *and* $|t| \lesssim \lambda^{5/12}$, $k \geq 0$.

6. The proof of Theorem 2.10

For the proof we will need the following modification of [4, Lemma 26.4.14] which is Lemma 7.1 in [2]. Recall that $\mathcal{D}'_\Gamma = \{\, u \in \mathcal{D}' : \operatorname{WF}(u) \subset \Gamma \,\}$ for $\Gamma \subset T^*\mathbf{R}^n$, and that $\|u\|_{(k)}$ is the L^2 Sobolev norm of order k of $u \in C_0^\infty$.

Lemma 6.1. *Let*

$$u_\lambda(x) = \lambda^{(n-1)\delta/2} \exp(i\lambda^\varrho \omega(\lambda^\varepsilon x)) \sum_{j=0}^{M} \varphi_j(\lambda^\delta x)\lambda^{-j\kappa} \tag{6.1}$$

with $\omega \in C^\infty(\mathbf{R}^n)$ *satisfying* $\operatorname{Im}\omega \geq 0$ *and* $|d\omega| \geq c > 0$, $\varphi_j \in C_0^\infty(\mathbf{R}^n)$, $\lambda \geq 1$, ε, δ, κ *and* ϱ *are positive such that* $\varepsilon < \delta < \varepsilon + \varrho$. *Here* ω *and* φ_j *may depend on* λ *but uniformly, and* φ_j *has fixed compact support in all but one of the variables, for which the support is bounded by* $C\lambda^\delta$. *Then for any integer* N *we have*

$$\|u_\lambda\|_{(-N)} \leq C\lambda^{-N(\varepsilon+\varrho)} \tag{6.2}$$

If $\varphi_0(x_0) \neq 0$ *and* $\operatorname{Im}\omega(x_0) = 0$ *for some* x_0 *then there exists* $c > 0$ *and* $\lambda_0 \geq 1$ *so that*

$$\|u_\lambda\|_{(-N)} \geq c\lambda^{-(N+\frac{n}{2})(\varepsilon+\varrho)+(n-1)\delta/2} \qquad \lambda \geq \lambda_0 \tag{6.3}$$

Let $\Sigma = \bigcap_{\lambda\geq 1}\bigcup_j \operatorname{supp}\varphi_j(\lambda\,\cdot)$ *and let* Γ *be the cone generated by*

$$\{\, (x, \partial\omega(x)),\ x \in \Sigma,\ \operatorname{Im}\omega(x) = 0 \,\} \tag{6.4}$$

then for any real m we find $\lambda^m u_\lambda \to 0$ in $\mathcal{D}'_\Gamma$ so $\lambda^m A u_\lambda \to 0$ in C^∞ if A is a pseudo-differential operator such that $\mathrm{WF}(A) \cap \Gamma = \emptyset$. The estimates are uniform if $\omega \in C^\infty$ uniformly with fixed lower bound on $|d \operatorname{Re} \omega|$, and $\varphi_j \in C^\infty$ uniformly.

We shall use Lemma 6.1 for u_λ in (3.29), then ω will be real valued and Γ in (6.4) will be the bicharacteristic Γ_j converging to a limit bicharacteristic.

Proof of Lemma 6.1. We shall adapt the proof of [4, Lemma 26.4.14] to this case. By making the change of variables $y = \lambda^\varepsilon x$ we find that

$$\hat{u}_\lambda(\xi) = \lambda^{(n-1)\delta/2-n\varepsilon} \sum_{j=0}^{M} \lambda^{-j\kappa} \int e^{i(\lambda^\varrho \omega(y) - \langle y, \xi/\lambda^\varepsilon \rangle)} \varphi_j(\lambda^{\delta-\varepsilon} y)\, dy \tag{6.5}$$

Let U be a neighborhood of the projection on the second component of the set in (6.4). When $\xi/\lambda^{\varepsilon+\varrho} \notin U$ then for $\lambda \gg 1$ we have that

$$\bigcup_j \operatorname{supp} \varphi_j(\lambda^{\delta-\varepsilon}\cdot) \ni y \mapsto (\lambda^\varrho \omega(y) - \langle y, \xi/\lambda^\varepsilon \rangle)/(\lambda^\varrho + |\xi|/\lambda^\varepsilon)$$
$$= (\omega(y) - \langle y, \xi/\lambda^{\varepsilon+\varrho} \rangle)/(1 + |\xi|/\lambda^{\varepsilon+\varrho})$$

is in a compact set of functions with non-negative imaginary part with a fixed lower bound on the gradient of the real part. Thus, by integrating by part in (6.5) we find for any positive integer m that

$$|\hat{u}_\lambda(\xi)| \le C_m \lambda^{-(n-1)\delta/2+m(\delta-\varepsilon)} (\lambda^\varrho + |\xi|/\lambda^\varepsilon)^{-m} \qquad \xi/\lambda^{\varepsilon+\varrho} \notin U \qquad \lambda \gg 1 \tag{6.6}$$

This gives any negative power of λ for m large enough since $\delta < \varepsilon + \varrho$. If V is bounded and $0 \notin \overline{V}$ then since u_λ is uniformly bounded in L^2 we find

$$\int_{\tau V} |\hat{u}_\lambda(\xi)|^2 (1 + |\xi|^2)^{-N}\, d\xi \le C_V \tau^{-2N} \qquad \tau \ge 1$$

Using this estimate with $\tau = \lambda^{\varepsilon+\varrho}$ together with the estimate (6.6) we obtain (6.2). If $\chi \in C_0^\infty$ then we may apply (6.6) to χu_λ, thus we find for any positive integer j that

$$|\widehat{\chi u}_\lambda(\xi)| \le C_j \lambda^{-(n-1)\delta/2+j(\delta-\varepsilon)} (\lambda^\varrho + |\xi|/\lambda^\varepsilon)^{-j} \qquad \xi \in W \qquad \lambda \gg 1$$

if W is any closed cone with $\Gamma \bigcap (\operatorname{supp} \chi \times W) = \emptyset$. Thus we find that $\lambda^m u_\lambda \to 0$ in $\mathcal{D}'_\Gamma$ for every m. To prove (6.3) we assume $x_0 = 0$ and take $\psi \in C_0^\infty$. If $\operatorname{Im} \omega(0) = 0$ and $\varphi(0) \neq 0$ we find

$$\lambda^{n(\varepsilon+\varrho)-(n-1)\delta/2} e^{-i\lambda^\varrho \operatorname{Re} \omega(0)} \langle u_\lambda, \psi(\lambda^{\varepsilon+\varrho}\cdot) \rangle$$
$$= \int e^{i\lambda^\varrho(\omega(x/\lambda^\varrho)-\omega(0))} \psi(x) \sum_j \varphi_j(x/\lambda^{\varepsilon+\varrho-\delta}) \lambda^{-j\kappa}\, dx$$
$$\to \int e^{i\langle \operatorname{Re} \partial_x \omega(0), x \rangle} \psi(x) \varphi_0(0)\, dx \qquad \lambda \to +\infty$$

which is not equal to zero for some suitable $\psi \in C_0^\infty$. In fact, we have $\varphi_j(x/\lambda^{\varepsilon+\varrho-\delta}) = \varphi_j(0) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^{\delta-\varepsilon-\varrho}) \to \varphi_j(0)$ when $\lambda \to \infty$, because $\delta < \varepsilon + \varrho$. Since

$$\|\psi(\lambda^{\varepsilon+\varrho}\cdot)\|_{(N)} \leq C\lambda^{(N-n/2)(\varepsilon+\varrho)}$$

we obtain that $0 < c \leq \lambda^{(N+\frac{n}{2})(\varepsilon+\varrho)-(n-1)\delta/2}\|u\|_{(-N)}$ which gives (6.3) and the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 2.10. Assume that Γ is a limit bicharacteristic of P. We are going to show that (2.22) does not hold for any ν, N and any pseudodifferential operator A such that $\Gamma \cap \mathrm{WF}(A) = \emptyset$. This means that there exists approximate solutions $0 \neq u_j \in C_0^\infty$ to $P^*u_j \cong 0$ such that

$$\|u_j\|_{(-N)}/(\|P^*u_j\|_{(\nu)} + \|u_j\|_{(-N-n)} + \|Au_j\|_{(0)}) \to \infty \qquad \text{when } j \to \infty \tag{6.7}$$

which will contradict the local solvability of P at Γ by Remark 2.11.

Let $\Gamma_j \subset \Sigma \bigcap S^*X$ be a sequence of semibicharacteristics of p that converges to $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_2$ and let λ_j be given by (2.10) and (3.4) with $\varepsilon > 0$. Now the conditions and conclusions are invariant under symplectic changes of homogeneous coordinates and multiplication by elliptic pseudodifferential operators. Thus by Proposition 3.3 we may assume that the coordinates are chosen so that $\Gamma_j = I \times (0, 0, \xi_j)$ with $|\xi_j| = 1$, and for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1/3$ and $c > 0$ we can write $P^* = Q + R \in \Psi^1_{1,0}$ where $\Gamma_j \cap \mathrm{WF}_\varepsilon(R) = \emptyset$ and Q has symbol

$$\tau - r(t, x, \xi) + q_0(t, x, \xi) + r_0(t, x, \xi) \tag{6.8}$$

when $|\xi| \cong \lambda_j$ and the homogeneous distance to Γ_j is less than $c\lambda_j^{-\varepsilon}$. We have that $R \in S^{1+\varepsilon}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$, $r_0 \in S^{3\varepsilon-1}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$, $q_0 \in S^{\varepsilon}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ is given by (3.24), and $r \in S^{1-\varepsilon}_{1-\varepsilon,\varepsilon}$ with real part vanishing of second order at Γ_j, and the bounds are uniform in the symbol classes.

Now, we may replace the norms $\|u\|_{(s)}$ in (6.7) by the norms

$$\|u\|_s^2 = \|\langle D_x\rangle^s u\|^2 = \int \langle\xi\rangle^{2s}|\hat{u}(\tau,\xi)|^2\, d\tau d\xi$$

and the corresponding spaces H_s. In fact, the quotient $\langle\xi\rangle/\langle(\tau,\xi)\rangle \cong 1$ when $|\tau| \lesssim |\xi|$, thus in a conical neighborhood of Γ. So replacing the norms in the estimate (6.7) only changes the constant and the operator A in the estimate (2.22). By using Proposition 3.4 we may assume that the grazing Lagrangean space $L_j(w) \equiv \{\,(s, y; 0, 0) :\ (s, y) \in \mathbf{R}^n\,\}$, $\forall\, w \in \Gamma_j$, after conjugation with a uniformly bounded C^1 section $F(t)$ of homogeneous Fourier integral operators, then $\partial_x^2 \operatorname{Re} r = 0$ at Γ_j and $\Gamma \cap \mathrm{WF}_\varepsilon(A) = \emptyset$. Observe that for each t we find that $F(t)$ is uniformly continuous in local H_s spaces, which we may use in (6.7) after changing A. Also the conjugation of $F(t)$ with the operator with symbol (6.8) has a uniformly bounded expansion. In fact, this follows since $t \mapsto F(t) \in C^1$ are homogeneous Fourier integral operators in the x variables and these preserve the symbol classes. By changing A again, we may then replace the local $\|u\|_s$ norms by the norms $\|u\|_{(s)}$ in (6.7) so that we can use Lemma 6.1.

Now, by choosing $\delta = 5/12$, $\varepsilon = 1/8$ and $\varrho = 1/24$ and using Propositions 3.5, 4.2, 5.3 and Remark 5.4, we can for each Γ_j construct approximate solution u_{λ_j} on the form (3.29) so that $Qu_{\lambda_j} = \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{-k})$, for any k. The real valued phase function is equal to is $\langle x, \xi_j\rangle + \omega_j(t,x)$ where $|\xi_j| = 1$ and $\omega_j(t,x) \in S({\lambda_j}^{-7/8}, g_{3/8})$ and the values of

$$(t, x; \lambda_j \partial_t \omega_j(t,x), \lambda_j(\xi_j + \partial_x \omega_j(t,x)))$$

have homogeneous distance $\lesssim \lambda_j^{-5/12}$ to the rays through Γ_j when $|x| \lesssim {\lambda_j}^{-5/12}$, thus on $\operatorname{supp} u_{\lambda_j}$. Observe that if $\lambda_j \gg 1$ then we have that $|\xi_0 + \partial_x \omega_j(t,x)| \cong 1$ in $\operatorname{supp} u_{\lambda_j}$. In fact, we have

$$\omega_j(t,x) = {\lambda_j}^{-7/8} \widetilde{\omega}_j({\lambda_j}^{3/8} t, {\lambda_j}^{3/8} x)$$

where $\widetilde{\omega}_j \in C^\infty$ uniformly so $\partial_x \omega_j = \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{-1/2})$ and

$$\lambda_j(\langle x, \xi_j\rangle + \omega_j(t,x)) = {\lambda_j}^{5/8}\langle {\lambda_j}^{3/8} x, \xi_j\rangle + {\lambda_j}^{1/8} \widetilde{\omega}_j({\lambda_j}^{3/8} t, {\lambda_j}^{3/8} x) \quad \text{when } |x| \lesssim \lambda_j^{-5/12}$$

Thus $\delta = 5/12$, $\varrho = 5/8$, $\varepsilon = 3/8$ and $\kappa = 1/24$ in (6.1) so $\varepsilon + \varrho = 1 > \delta > \varepsilon$.

The amplitude functions $\varphi_{k,j}(t,x) = \phi_{k,j}({\lambda_j}^{5/12} t, {\lambda_j}^{5/12} x)$ where $\phi_{k,j} \in C_0^\infty$ uniformly in j with fixed compact support in x, but in t the support is bounded by $C{\lambda_j}^{5/12}$, so u_{λ_j} will satisfy the conditions in Lemma 6.1 uniformly. Clearly differentiation of Qu_{λ_j} can at most give a factor λ_j since $\varepsilon + \varrho = 1$ and $\delta < 1$. Because of the bound on the support of u_{λ_j} we may obtain that

$$\|Qu_{\lambda_j}\|_{(\nu)} = \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{-N-n}) \tag{6.9}$$

for any given ν.

If $\operatorname{WF}(A) \bigcap \Gamma = \emptyset$, then we find $\operatorname{WF}(A) \bigcap \Gamma_j = \emptyset$ for large j, so Lemma 6.1 gives $\|Au_{\lambda_j}\|_{(0)} = \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{-N-n})$ when $j \to \infty$. On $\operatorname{supp} u_{\lambda_j}$ we have $x = \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{-5/12})$ so the values of $(t, x; \lambda_j \partial_t \omega_j(t,x), \lambda_j(\xi_j + \partial_x \omega_j(t,x)))$ have homogeneous distance $\lesssim \lambda_j^{-5/12}$ to the rays through Γ_j and these converge to Γ. Thus, if $R \in S^{9/8}_{7/8,1/8}$ such that $\operatorname{WF}_{1/8}(R) \bigcup \Gamma_j = \emptyset$ then we find from the expansion (3.30) that all the terms of Ru_{λ_j} vanish for large enough λ_j. In fact, since $\lambda_j^{-5/12} \ll \lambda_j^{-1/8}$ for $j \gg 1$, we find for any α and K that

$$\partial^\alpha R(t, x; \lambda_j((0, \xi_j) + \partial_{t,x} \omega_j(t,x))) = O(\lambda_j^{-K})$$

in $\bigcup_k \operatorname{supp} \varphi_{k,j}$. As before, we find that $\|Ru_{\lambda_j}\|_{(\nu)} = \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{-N-n})$ by the bound on the support of u_{λ_j}, so we obtain from (6.9) that

$$\|P^* u_{\lambda_j}\|_{(\nu)} = \mathcal{O}(\lambda_j^{-N-n}) \tag{6.10}$$

for any given ν.

Since $\varepsilon + \varrho = 1$ and $\delta > 0$ we also find from Lemma 6.1 that

$$\lambda_j^{-N} = \lambda_j^{-N(\varepsilon+\varrho)} \gtrsim \|u_{\lambda_j}\|_{(-N)} \gtrsim \lambda_j^{-(N+\frac{n}{2})(\varepsilon+\varrho)+(n-1)\delta/2} \geq \lambda_j^{-N-n/2}$$

when $\lambda_j \geq 1$. We obtain that (6.7) holds for $u_j = u_{\lambda_j}$ when $j \to \infty$, so Remark 2.11 gives that P is not solvable at the limit bicharacteristic Γ. □

References

[1] Nils Dencker. The resolution of the Nirenberg-Treves conjecture. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 163(2):405–444, 2006.
[2] Nils Dencker. Solvability and limit bicharacteristics. *J. Pseudo-Differ. Oper. Appl.*, 7:295–320, 2016.
[3] Lars Hörmander. Pseudodifferential operators of principal type. In *Singularities in boundary value problems (Proc. NATO Adv. Study Inst., Maratea, 1980)*, volume 65 of *NATO Adv. Study Inst. Ser. C: Math. Phys. Sci.*, pages 69–96. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1981.
[4] Lars Hörmander. *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators*, volume I–IV. Springer Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, Tokyo, 1983–1985.
[5] G. A. Mendoza and G. A. Uhlmann. A necessary condition for local solvability for a class of operators with double characteristics. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 52(2):252–256, 1983.
[6] Gerardo A. Mendoza. A necessary condition for solvability for a class of operators with involutive double characteristics. In *Microlocal analysis (Boulder, Colo., 1983)*, volume 27 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 193–197. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1984.
[7] François Trèves. *Introduction to pseudodifferential and Fourier integral operators. Vol. 2.* Plenum Press, New York-London, 1980. Fourier integral operators, The University Series in Mathematics.

Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Lund, Box 118, SE-221 00 Lund, Sweden

E-mail address: dencker@maths.lth.se